Par. 8.2.1.1.52
330

Wednesday,
25th April, 1956

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

CONTENTS

[VOLUME III, NOS. 41—60—17TH APRIL TO 14TH MAY, 1956)

	COLUMNS
No. 41. Tuesday, 17th April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1504, 1505, 1507 to 1515, 1518, 1519, 1521, 1523, 1524, 1528, 1530, 1532 to 1538	2377-2411
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1506, 1516, 1517, 1520, 1522, 1525 to 1527, 1529, 1539 to 1543	2411-16
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1070 to 1126	2417-44
Daily Digest	2445-50
No. 42. Wednesday, 18th April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1544 to 1546, 1548 to 1551, 1553, 1556, 1557, 1559, to 1563, 1565, 1566, 1569, 1571 to 1574, 1577	2451-83
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Question Nos. 1547 ,1552, 1554, 1555, 1558, 1564, 1567, 1568, 1570, 1575, 1576, 1578 to 1581	2484-90
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1127 to 1168 and 1170 to 1198	2490-2530
Daily Digest	2531-36
No. 43. Friday, 20th April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1582 to 1584, 1586, 1589, 1593, 1595 to 1597, 1600, 1601, 1603 to 1607, 1609, 1610, 1612 to 1615	2537-72
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1585, 1587, 1588, 1591, 1592, 1594, 1598, 1599, 1602, 1608, 1616	2572-78
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1199 to 1250, 1252 to 1264	2578-2614
Daily Digest	2615-18
No. 44. Saturday, 21st April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1617 to 1619, 1621, 1623, 1624, 1627 to 1630, 1632 to 1639, 1641, 1642, 1644, 1645, 1626, 1631	2619-53
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1395, 1415, 1620, 1622, 1625, 1640	2653-56
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1265 to 1297, 1299 to 1308	2656-78
Daily Digest	2679-82

No. 45. *Monday, 23rd April,* 1956

	Columns
Member Sworn	2683
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1646 to 1649, 1652, 1654 to 1659, 1662, 1663, 1672, 1665 to 1668, 1670, 1673, 1675, 1678, 1679, 1660, 1664 and 1651	2683-2716
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1650, 1653, 1661, 1669, 1671, 1674, 1676, 1677, 1680	2716-20
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1309 to 1352, 1354 to 1369	2720-50
Daily Digest	2751-56

No. 46. *Tuesday, 24th April,* 1956

Member Sworn	2757
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1681, to 1683, 1689, 1680, 1695, 1697, 1701, 1702, 1704, 1706, 1708, 1709, 1711, 1713, to 1715, 1717, 1687, 1691	2757-87
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1684 to 1686, 1688, 1692 to 1694, 1696, 1698 to 1700, 1703, 1705, 1707, 1710, 1712, 1716	2787-95
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1370 to 1410, 1412 to 1418, 1420 to 1423, 1425 to 1435	2796-2830
Daily Digest	2831-36

No. 47. *Wednesday, 25th April,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1718 to 1722, 1724, 1727, 1730 to 1732, 1734, 1736 to 1739, 1741, 1743, 1723, 1725, 1726	2837-70
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1728, 1729, 1733, 1735, 1740, 1742	2870-73
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1436 to 1462, 1464 to 1493	2873-2902
Daily Digest	2903-06

No. 48. *Thursday, 26th April,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1745 to 1748, 1752 to 1760, 1763, 1765, 1767 to 1770, 1772, 1744, 1766	2907-40
Short Notice Question No. 12	2940-42
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1749 to 1751, 1761, 1762, 1764, 1771	2942-45
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1494 to 1497, 1499 to 1521	2945-60
Daily Digest	2961-64

	Columns
No. 49. Friday, 27th April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1773, 1774, 1776, 1779, 1781 to 1789, 1791 to 1793, 1795, 1797 to 1799, 1801, 1802	2965-99
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1775, 1777, 1778, 1780, 1790, 1796, 1803, 1804	2999-3003
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1523 to 1539, 1541 to 1562	3003-22
Daily Digest	3023-26
No. 50. Monday, 30th April, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1806 to 1811, 1813 to 1816, 1820 to 1824, 1826 to 1830, 1832, 1833	3027-61
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1805, 1812, 1817 to 1819, 1825, 1831	3061-65
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1563 to 1575, 1577 to 1607	3065-86
Daily Digest	3087-90
No. 51. Tuesday, 1st May, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1834, 1836, 1839, 1845, 1847, 1848, 1852, to 1855, 1857, 1861, 1835, 1843, 1844, 1862	3091-3122
Short Notice Question No. 13	3122-25
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1837, 1838, 1840 to 1842, 1846, 1849, to 1851, 1856, 1858 to 1860	3126-32
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1608 628 to 1626 to 1641	3131-48
Daily Digest	3149-52
No. 52. Wedensday, 2nd May, 1956	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1863, 1864, 1866, 1870, 1872, 1873, 1876 to 1878, 1880, 1882 to 1884, 1887, 1889, 1892, 1893, 1895 to 1897	3153-86
Short Notice Questions Nos. 14 and 15	3187-91
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1865, 1867 to 1869, 1871, 1874, 1875, 1879, 1881, 1885, 1886, 1888, 1890, 1891, 1894	3191-3201
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1642 to 1654, 1656 to 1686, 1688 to 1710	3201-34
Daily Digest	3235-40

No. 53. *Thursday, 3rd May,* 1956 — COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1899 to 1902, 1904 to 1908, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1917 to 1924 3241-74

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1898, 1903, 1909, 1912, 1914 and 1915 3275-77

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1711 to 1759 . 3277-3300

Daily Digest 3301-04

No. 54. *Friday, 4th May,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1925, 1927, 1930, 1938, 1940, 1942 to 1946, 1948, 1949, 1953, 1956, 1958, 1960, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1926, 1963, 1931, 1937 3305-37

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1928, 1929, 1932, 1934 to 1936, 1939, 1941, 1947, 1950 to 1952, 1954, 1955, 1957, 1959, 1961, 1965 . . 3337-46

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1760 to 1797 . 3347-64

Daily Digest . . 3365-68

No. 55. *Monday, 7th May,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions

Starred Questions Nos. 1967, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1984, 1986 to 1988, 1991 to 1993, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2000, 1968, 1970, 1999, 1983, 1989 3369-3404

Short Notice Question No. 16 . 3404-07

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1973, 1974, 1976, 1977, 1996, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1994, 2001 to 2003 3407-12

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1798 to 1836, 1838 to 1850 . . 3413-38

Daily Digest . . 3439-42

No. 56. *Tuesday, 8th May,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 2004, 2007, 2009, 2012 to 2016, 2018, 2019, 2021, 2022, 2024, 2028, 2030 to 2032, 2034 3443-75

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 2005, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2017, 2020, 2023, 2025 to 2027, 2029, 2033, 2035, 2036 3475-81

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1852 to 1885, 1887 to 1893 . . 3481-3502

Daily Digest 3503-06

No. 57. *Wednesday, 9th May,* 1956

	Columns
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2039, 2040, 2042, 2043, 2045 to 2050, 2052, 2056 to 2060	3507-40
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2037, 2041, 2044, 2051, 2053 to 2055, 2061 to 2083	3540-55
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1894 to 1924, 1926 to 1938	3555-80
Daily Digest	3581-84

No. 58. *Thursday,* 10*th May,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2084, 2085, 2087, 2090 to 2092, 2094, 2095, 2098 to 2102, 2105 to 2107, 2109, 2111 to 2116	3585-3619
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2086, 2088, 2089, 2096, 2097, 2103, 2104, 2108, 2110, 2117 to 2125	3619-28
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1939 to 1964	3628-42
Daily Digest	3643-46

No. 59. *Friday,* 11*th May,* 1956

Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2128, 2131, 2133, 2137, 2139, 2142 to 2144, 2149 to 2151, 2153, 2156, 2126, 2129, 2145, 2146, 2148, 2154, 2155	3647-81
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2127, 2132, 2134 to 2136, 2138, 2140, 2141, 2147, 2152, 2157	3681-85
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1965 to 1992	3685-3700
Daily Digest	3701-04

No. 60. *Monday,* 14*th May,* 1956

Member Sworn	3705
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2158 to 2162, 2164 to 2170, 2172, 2173, 2175, 2176, 2178 to 2181	3705-37
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 2163, 2171, 2174, 2177, 2183 to 2196	3737-46
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1993 to 2031	3746-66
Daily Digest	3767-70

GIPN—S4—122 Lok Sabha—26-3-57—840

BIOCK G
Acc. No. 25566
Dated. 30.03.2015

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, 25th April, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Half Past Ten of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

छावनी की जमीन

*१७१८. **श्री. भक्त दर्शन** : क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री ६ दिसम्बर, १९५५ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या ७१६ के उत्तर के सम्बन्धमें यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या छावनियों की जमीन सम्बधी नियमों में संशोधन करने के प्रश्न पर अब कुछ निर्णय कर लिया गया है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या उस निर्णय की एक प्रति लोक सभा के पटल पर रखी जायेगी ?

प्रतिरक्षा उपमंत्रि (सरदार मजीठिया) :
(क) आखरी फैसला अभी तक भी नही किया जा सका है ।

(ख) प्रश्न नही उठता ।

श्री. भक्त दर्शन : आज से कही महीने पहिले यानी ४ अगस्त, १९५५ को प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री डा. काटजू ने यह बताया था कि इस सम्बध में कुछ नया मसाला जमा किया जा रहा है और मुखतलिफ केंटोनमेंट्स की पोजीशन जानने के लिये एक सर्वे हो रहा है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या देरी का कारण यही है कि अभी तक आंकडे जमा नही हुए हैं या कोई और वैधानिक अड़चन है या कोई दूसरी दिक्कतें हैं?

Sardar Majithia: There is no such difficulty, but a number of items of information have to be got hold of, as for instance, the number of sites held on old grant terms, the number of sites under the old grant terms, but on which buildings have been built, the number of sites held on old cantonment leases, etc. In all, there are about nine items of information to be collected. All these figures are very complicated, and they have to be collected before a final decision can be taken, and hence the delay. But I can assure the House that within about four to five months' time, we should be able to definitely finalise the whole thing.

श्री. भक्त दर्शन : क्या माननीय उपमंत्री जी को याद है कि माननीय त्यागी जी ने यह आश्वासन दिया था कि इसमे बहुत जल्दी की जाएगी मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय के यहां बहुत जल्दी की परिभाषा क्या है ?

Shri C. D. Pande: What is the definition of 'as soon as possible'?

Sardar Majithia: I can give the definition. But as the House knows, and as you, Sir, in particular, know, during the last two or three years, the main difficulty has been because the position regarding our key location plants had not been finalised for obvious reasons, and hence the delay in this matter. That, of course, was a more important problem than any other.

Shri B. D. Pande: Many cantonments have been deserted, and my beautiful cantonment of Almora has become deserted. What was once a very beautiful garden and a lovely place has now become a desert. I want to know when the question of rehabilitation will be considered.

Sardar Majithia: No doubt, Almora cantonment is a very beautiful place.

Shri Bansal: What about Ranikhet?

Sardar Majithia: One question at a time please.

It is a very beautiful place, but the distance is so much, and the communication is so difficult that at the moment I think it is not possible to rehabilitate the cantonment straight off.

Shri B. D. Pande : If the regiment is not being located there, then the area can be transferred to the civil authorities.

Sardar Majithia : That will be considered.

Shri Keshavaiengar: May I know the reason why the land occupied by the military in the original cantonment area of the city of Bangalore is not being released back to the Corporation, in spite of repeated requests by the Mysore Government and the Corporation?

Sardar Majithia: I shall require notice.

Mr. Speaker: It is an individual matter.

Shri Bansal: Does the Minister remember that he himself gave a promise on the floor of this House that a comprehensive Bill to amend the cantonment law would be brought forward before this House very soon, and if so, may I know what he is doing about it?

Sardar Majithia: I beg to submit that that does not arise out of this question.

सम्पदा शुल्क

*१७१६ **श्री विभूति मिश्र :** क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि १९५४ और १९५५ में बिहार के विभिन्न जिलों में सम्पदा शुल्क के रूप में पृथक-पृथक कितनी राशि वसूल की गई ?

राजस्व और असैनिक व्यय मंत्री (श्री एम० सी० शाह) : सभा की मेज पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है जिसमें बताया गया है कि १९५४ और १९५५ में बिहार के विभिन्न जिलों से कितना सम्पत्ति शुल्क इकट्ठा हुआ [देखिये परिशिष्ट १०, अनुबन्ध सं १३]

श्री विभूति मिश्र : इस विवरण को देखने से पता चलता है कि बिहार के १७ जिलों में से केवल आठ का ही हिसाब दिया गया है । इनमें से भी सारन जिलेमें हि केवल ८०७ रूपये १९५४ में सरकार को मिले । १९५५ में सरकार को इन आठ जिलों से जिन का वर्णन इस स्टेटमेंट में किया गया है कल ३४,५३१ रूपये प्राप्त हुये । में बतलाना चाहता हूं कि मेरे जिले में एक वितीया महारानी मर गई हैं और उनके मरे एक साल हो गया और वह लाखों की सम्पत्ति छोड गई है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार का डिपार्टमेंट इस विषय में क्या कर रहा हैं ।

Shri M. C. Shah: If these matters are brought to the notice of the Finance Ministry, we shall enquire and find out whether there are any evasions in regard to the payment of estate duty. All the cases that were registered have been looked into. We have got an elaborate machinery to find out whether persons who have died have left taxable property. If the accounting persons do not file any returns, then we take action.

I would invite the hon. Member, if he has got any such case in mind, to send it on to us immediately, so that we shall enquire and take action to augment our revenues from estate duty.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: From the statement, I find that the amount collected during the last two years was less than Rs. 34,000. May I know whether that was due to decrease in morality or mortality rate, or due to inefficiency?

Shri M. C. Shah: This tax can be collected only from the heirs of the deceased who have left taxable property. So, the reason is that during that period, very few persons have left property which can be assessed to estate duty, because of the exemption clause of Rs. 1 lakh in individual cases, and Rs. 50,000 in the case of joint undivided Hindu families.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether the slowness of work and the lowness of the amount realised are due

to there not being special staff in charge of this work?

Shri M. C. Shah: I could not catch the question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the collection of a small amount due to want of adequate staff?

Shri M. C. Shah: No, there is adequate staff. It is not due to not having adequate staff. But as I stated, it is due to the small number of deaths of persons leaving property.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जल्दी से जल्दी वसूली करने के बारे में गवर्नमेंट क्या उपाय कर रही है? मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूं कि विजिया महारानी जो मर गई हैं, उनका ७० लाख रूपया अभी भी बैंक में जमा पड़ा है ।

Shri M. C. Shah: We shall be obliged, if the hon. Member could send that information to us, and if as he has alleged, the party has left Rs. 75 lakhs worth of property, then we shall be very happy to just tax that property in the hands of the heirs of the deceased. So far, we have not got any such report.

Oil and Natural Gas Directorate

***1720. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of branch offices that are going to be opened for the Directorate of Oil and Natural Gas recently formed at Dehra Dun;

(b) whether it is a fact that there is no surface indications of oil in India except in Assam;

(c) whether any special geophysical methods will be adopted for research of oil; and

(d) the amount to be allotted for this Directorate during the Second Five Year Plan?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) No decision has yet been taken to open any branch offices.

(b) So far as definite information goes, surface indications are found in Jwalamukhi.

(c) All standard methods of geophysical exploration including magnetic, gravity, seismic and electrical, will be used.

(d) Rs. 30 crores.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Russian experts on oil exploration have submitted any report before they left the country, and if so, whether there is any hint of geophysical survey contained therein?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The Russian experts left the country yesterday evening. They have submitted a report, and that report has been discussed with them many a time.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether Government propose to divide the country into different regions with someone at the head?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes, there is a proposal to divide the country from the point of view of our programme of oil exploration. All those matters are being considered by the Oil and Natural Gas Directorate.

Shri Bansal: May I know if the Russian experts have left behind very elaborate maps and charts showing the oil-bearing areas in the country? If so, which are the areas they have indicated?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: In this short time, it was not possible for any oil experts to give very elaborate map of all the oil-bearing areas. But surely there are very good maps which do indicate that certain areas contain very favourable structures where a more elaborate and detailed examination is needed.

Shri Bansal: He did not reply to the second part of my question. Which are those areas?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member cannot be allowed to go on asking for many many details. There are other matters.

Shri Bansal: It is the same question.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: May I know whether it is proposed to set up one of the branch offices in Assam where oil is found?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Assam oil is being tackled by the Assam Oil Company. The proposal is to have a joint company with the Government of India. Perhaps the direct exploration programme of the Government of India will not apply in Assam.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know whether these Russian experts reported that surface indications of oil were found in a place in the east coast of South India? May I also know whether, in view of the fact that there is already a report about the existence of natural gas in many areas in Andhra, the Directorate will have a branch there?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The term 'surface indication' is a technical term, which may not necessarily mean gas or oil seepage. But so far as gas or oil seepage is concerned, the definite information that we have is in the Jwalamukhi area and at one or two other places which are not significant, and which may not be directly oil or natural gas but may be coal gas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister may place the report on the Table of the House.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: It is yet too premature, Sir.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE

*1721. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government are considering a proposal to set up a high-level Commission which will go into the question of organisation, objective and other matters concerning the Indian Civil Service?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): No, Sir.

The views of Government with regard to organisation and other matters pertaining to the services were stated by the Home Minister in the course of the discussion on the Grants for the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know whether, in view of the views expressed by this House on an earlier occasion in connection with a non-official Resolution on the subject, Government propose to take some action in the matter in the near future, even though at that time they had opposed the setting up of a high-level Commission?

Shri Datar: That is what has been made clear by the Home Minister. He stated that he was contemplating the appointment of a Commission, or rather a Committee, because he said that the Commission might take long. Details with regard to the terms of reference of this Committee and so on are under consideration.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know whether before setting up any such Commission or Committee, State Governments will be consulted and their opinions invited?

Shri Datar: The State Governments will have to be consulted regarding the advisability of forming such a Committee.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Could the hon. Minister give any indication of the time by which Government will be able to make the announcement?

Shri Datar: It is rather too early; probably in the course of the next three months.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इसबात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि हमारी सरकार समाजवादी ढांचे पर देश को ले जा रही है कि क्या सरकार इस तरह कि कोई अपील निकाल रही है। आई. सी. एस. का पर्सोनेल खुद ब खुद अपनी तनख्वाहों में कमी करे ?

श्री दातार : सरकार इन सब बातों पर विचार करेगी।

Shri Raghubir Sahai: May I know what is the total strength of the ICS officers at present, and what is the break-up State-wise?

Shri Datar: So far as the strength is concerned, it is, I believe, approximately 300. I cannot give the break-up offhand.

OIL WELLS IN ASSAM

*1722. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether drilling of oil wells in Assam would be completed this year; and

(b) if so, whether oil production would start in the current year?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). Drilling of oil wells will continue so long as there are indications of the occurrence of oil in any portion of a given area. As a result of drilling already done, oil has been struck in the new field at Nahorkatiya and is in production along with oil being produced in the old Digboi field.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know the number of oil wells on which at present work is going on?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: In the new area, about 16 or 17 oil wells have been drilled so far. But in the area where the Assam Oil Company already possesses mining lease, perhaps a less number of oil wells have been drilled. But oil is being produced from the mining lease area.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Is it a fact that the company has asked for compensation with regard to these oil wells because Government have asked for 51 per cent share in the company which is to operate these wells?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: There is no such question as demand for compensation by the Assam Oil Company. There are many questions which are being considered for integrating the entire programme. One of them is to evaluate the price of crude oil which may be found there.

Shri P. C. Bose: May I know whether it is a fact that the working of new oil finds in Assam has been hampered and delayed for want of formation of a rupee company with the company concerned?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: No, Sir.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Could the hon. Minister give any indication of the increase in the quantity as a result of the new finds?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: It is very difficult to give any assessment of the quantity of oil, but certain guesses are made by the geologists. In one of the small areas, they are just now busy assessing the quantity of oil, and as soon as some firm figure is indicated by them, I will let the House know.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether any foreign experts, other than the experts of the Assam Oil Company, have also visited these areas? If so, what are their reports?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes, other experts have also visited the Assam area. Their assessment and evaluation of the work that is being done is quite good.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

*1724. **Shri Bishwanath Roy:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether attention of Government has been drawn to the data collected so far by the Directorate of Geology and Mining in Uttar Pradesh about the mineral wealth of the State; and

(b) if so, whether the Government of India propose to undertake the Geological Survey of the areas concerned in detail under the Second Five Year Plan?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). The Directorate of Geology and Mining of the Uttar Pradesh Government has just started functioning. The Geological Survey of India has not so far received any report or programme of work from the Directorate giving the date about the mineral wealth of U.P. that it may

have collected. Discussions have already been held between the two organizations for carrying out coordinated work in the U.P. The Geological Survery of India has planned to carry out a number of mineral and other investigations in U.P. in the Second Five Year Plan.

Shri Bishwa Nath Roy: May I know whether any survey has been undertaken this year?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Yes. There is a programme of mineral exploration prepared in U.P. and elsewhere from time to time. This year's programme has been completed, and now we will interpret the information that is collected. Next year, there will be another programme.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Which is the Ministry which determines the priority, as to whether one mine or the other should be worked? Is it the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research or some other Ministry.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The exploitation of mines is not the function of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research. So far as the private sector is concerned, they apply for lease to the State Governments and the latter, in consultation with the Central Government, give their consent to the working of a particular mine.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने जो अपना अलग जिओलेजिकल सब-डिपार्टमेंट (भूतत्वीय सर्वेक्षण विभाग) खोला है उसको केन्द्रीय सरकार किसी प्रकार की सहायता दे रही है और क्या उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई मांग की है?

श्री के. डी. मालवीय : जी हां जिस समय उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने अपना जिओलॉजिकल डिपार्टमेंट खोला उन्होंने हमसे सलाह मशविरा किया था और हमने उनको हर प्रकार से सहयोग दिया और सहायता का वचन दिया। पारसाल नैनिताल में इस सम्बन्ध में एक कानफरेंस सम्मेलत भी हुई थी हमारे विशेषज्ञ और उनके बीच मे एक प्रोग्राम तै किया गया था और उसी के अनुसार वे गालिबन (संभवतः) काम कर रहे हैं।

Foreign Magazines

***1727. Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of foreign magazines which have been allowed so far to book advertisements in India;

(b) whether the income derived from advertisements is remitted out of India;

(c) whether any terms and conditions are laid down while giving permission to book advertisements in India;

(d) if so, whether all the conditions, terms and assurances given in this respect so far have been carried out in each case; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): (a) *The Reader's Digest* is the only foreign magazine which has been given general permission to book advertisements in India.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) The only condition was that permission to remit the advertisement revenue outside India would not be asked for.

(d) Yes Sir.

(e) Does not arise.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether Government have any knowledge of the amount which this magazine gets from India by booking advertisements in India?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Advertisement receipts or subscription?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Advertisement receipts.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: They have their non-resident accounts and the amount comes to over Rs. 2 lakhs.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether Government is aware of the fact that in spite of their having concession to book advertisements in

India, while the price of the *Reader's Digest* in U.K. is 1sh. 6d. equivalent to Re. 1/2/-, it is being sold in India at Re. 1/8/- a copy?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Yes; the annual subscription is only Rs. 12 but if you buy one copy, it costs Re. 1/8/-.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether Government has any knowledge whether any other publisher in India is making efforts to get the right of publication of this magazine in India from the American publishers?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I do not have any knowledge; but the hon. Member may refer this question to the Information and Broadcasting Ministry.

INDIAN COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

*1730. **Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) who audits the accounts of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and Indian Council of Agricultural Research and on what basis;

(b) whether the Comptroller and Auditor General is entitled to audit or he can audit only on consent basis;

(c) whether audit reports relating to these are placed before Parliament; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): (a) The Accountant General, Central Revenues, audits the accounts of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research/Indian Council of Agricultural Research, as provided in the rules and bye-laws of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research/Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

(b) While the Comptroller and Auditor General of India is entitled to audit the accounts of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, the accounts of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research are audited by him now only on a consent basis.

(c) No.

(d) In the case of Council of Scientific and Industrial Research the accounts of the Council are audited only on consent basis, and therefore, no audit report is at present placed before Parliament. The rules of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research Society require only the audited accounts of the Society to be placed on the table of the Houses of Parliament and this is being done.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Since this is only on consent basis and not on a statutory basis, how is control of Parliament ensured over finances in this respect?

Shri M. C. Shah: These are autonomous bodies and their rules provide for this. Unless a law is passed by Parliament, this cannot be done.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: In view of the lacuna, is there any proposal to place the whole thing on a statutory basis?

Shri M. C. Shah: A proposal has been sent to the Ministry of Finance that a Bill should be piloted for this purpose.

Shri V. P. Nayar: If the amount is spent from out of the Consolidated Fund of India, where does the question of consent of the organisation come in, in view of the fact that the Auditor-General, is empowered by the Constitution, to audit any accounts for sums spent out of the Consolidated Fund of India?

Shri M. C. Shah: As these are autonomous bodies, the accounts can only be audited on consent basis. I do not know what the hon. Member wants.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That was not my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants an interpretation of the rules.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is not a question of interpretation.

Mr. Speaker: If an amount is paid from out of the Consolidated Fund of India for some charity to somebody, can the Auditor-General go and audit? It is a question of interpretation. I cannot allow it.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is not a question of interpretation; it is a question of fact.

कल्याण विस्तार योजनायें

*१७३१. **श्री अमर सिंह डामर** : क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में कल्याण-विस्तार-परियोजनाओं के खोलने के लिये कुल कितनी अनुमानित राशि व्यय की जायेगी ?

शिक्षा मंत्री के सभासचिव (डा० एम० एम० दास) : लगभग १५.६ करोड़ रुपये ।

श्री अमर सिंह डामर : दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में इस कार्य के लिये मध्य भारत के लिये कितनी धनराशी रक्खी गई है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: I have not the break-up with me at present.

श्री अमर सिंह डामर : अभी तक इस कार्य पर समूचे देश में कितनी धनराशि व्यय हुई है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: The question is about the amount estimated to be expended during the next Five Year Plan. The next Plan has only just begun and no expenditure has so far been made.

श्री अमर सिंह डामर : मेरा पहला प्रश्न यह था कि मध्य भारत के लिये दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना मे इस कार्य के लिए कितनी धनराशि रक्खी गई है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: I have not got the break-up with me.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am surprised that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary has not evidently read the question. The question relates to the total amount estimated to be expended. There is no question of a break-up. What is the total amount expected to be spent ?

Dr. M. M. Das: That has already been given in the reply; the total amount is approximately Rs. 15·9 crores.

Development of Fish Technology

*1732. **Shri Shivananjappa:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Central Food Technological Research Institute, Mysore has made extensive programmes for the development of fish technology;

(b) if so, whether the establishment of any laboratory is envisaged for this purpose; and

(c) where this laboratory will be located?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) to (c). The Central Food Technological Research Institute has planned to start investigations on fish technology including canning trials on various Indian fishes; refrigerated storage of fresh fish; utilisation of by-products of fisheries and cognate subjects. It is proposed to set up a sub-station for the purpose, the location of which has not yet been decided.

The Government of India have also under consideration a proposal to establish on the West Coast a Technological Station to undertake investigations on the various aspects of fishery technology.

Shri Shivananjappa: May I know what may be the approximate cost to work out or implement this proposal?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: So far as this Institute is concerned, that is the C.S.I.R. in respect of fish technology; the capital and recurring expenditure would be Rs. 1 lakh and Rs. .32 lakhs per annum respectively.

Shri B. S. Murthy: The hon. Minister said that a laboratory will be

established on the west coast. May I know what arrangements are being made for the east coast?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The various State Governments are already doing valuable work in fish technology research and they have got their own laboratories. It is only to add to those on certain points that it is considered desirable that we might have some more research stations and the Council has come forward with a proposal to have one unit in the western coast.

Shri Damodara Menon: May I know the place on the west coast where it is proposed to start this research station?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: The location has not yet been finalised.

Shri Damodara Menon: I did not hear.

Mr. Speaker: The place has not yet been fixed up.

Shri V. P. Nayar: In view of the fact that in Travancore-Cochin and the Malabar district, marine fisheries are so very developed and also in view of the fact that there is an institution at Kalamasery where there is a course for fish technology, has Government considered the desirability of expanding this particular institution in such a way as to accommodate this contemplated organisation also?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: As I said and as the hon. Member knows, work in the fish technological laboratory in Travancore-Cochin is going on quite satisfactorily and they are concerned with the work of improving the methods of fish processing and manufacture of fish oils and devising suitable methods for fish curing and connected problems. In Mandapam also, certain other investigations are being carried on. I suppose a good lot of work is going on. So, we have proposed to locate this laboratory somewhere else.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The hon. Minister says.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member makes a suggestion. He states it roundabout.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I mentioned another place where there is an institution.

Mr. Speaker: What the hon. Minister says is that he would like to fix it up somewhere else. Hon. Members have been allowed to make some suggestions, but it is rather strange that they should build up on them and then insist upon the hon. Minister, here why he should not accept their suggestions.

Confidential Reports of Government Officials

*1734. **Shri Nambiar:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that confidential reports of the employees of the Government of India are maintained in different offices of Government;

(b) if so, the reasons for it;

(c) since when this practice has been in vogue; and

(d) whether these reports also form the basis for promotion, demotion etc. of Government servants?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) Yes.

(b) Besides enabling Government to keep a watch on the work and conduct of a Government servant, the confidential report also gives a picture of his abilities and shortcomings.

(c) The practice has been in vogue for a very long time.

(d) Yes. The record of a Government servant is an important factor which is normally taken into consideration.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether it is a fact that Government servants are not informed of the entries made in their confidential reports?

Shri Datar: That is not correct. Whenever adverse entries are made, the normal rule is that a substance of the adverse remarks is communicated to the concerned Government servant and his explanation, if any, is kept along with the adverse remarks.

Shri Nambiar: What is the reason for giving only the substance and not the full report of what is entered there?

Shri Datar: The substance is fairly full.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I enquire whether it does not lead to favouritism? For example, in the case of Government servants who are doing the very same type of work, for some the report will be 'satisfactory'; for others 'very satisfactory' and for still others 'excellent', and that leads to favouritism. May I also add this? To the supplementary question put by my friend, the hon. Minister's answer was that if there are any adverse remarks, they will be brought to the notice of the Government servant concerned. But usually that is not done. At the time when the adverse remarks are made...

Mr. Speaker: Are we having a discussion on a resolution? I am not going to allow this to be answered. The hon. Member wants to make suggestions and sometimes the hon. Minister also wants to give explanation. Am I not supposed to see whether the question is intended to elicit answer or it seems to make suggestions. I am surprised at this type of question.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether any change has been made in the mode of recording the opinion of the superior officers after Independence?

Shri Datar: Only last year we issued a detailed circular, according to which these remarks have to be made by the officer under whom the Government servant is carrying on his duties, and then they are subjected to a supervision by an officer higher than this particular officer.

Shri Kamath: I heard the hon. Minister say that in the case of adverse remarks against an officer, his explanation is asked for and kept on the file. Am I to understand that no opportunity is given to the officer concerned against whom the adverse remarks have been made to make a representation to the proper authorities and later on, if necessary, to appeal also to the highest authority?

Shri Datar: There is no question of taking any action against him. What is done is that the confidential report is there and it contains the adverse remarks and his explanation. Both sides are taken into account and he can have a grievance only when either he is not promoted or something is done against him. Then he is also given an opportunity.....

Shri Kamath: If he wishes to get his adverse remarks expunged from the file, has he no right to make a representation for getting these removed? It ought to be done; is it not being done now? Even in British times it used to be done.

Shri Datar: We are following to a large extent the policy that they did. Recently, we have taken into account the policy that is being followed in other countries, and, therefore, our method is absolutely up-to-date.

Shri Kamath: I wonder.

Shri Nambiar: May I know what the Government means by saying "watching through the confidential files"?

Shri Datar: Whenever an occasion arises for the purpose of assessing the suitability or otherwise of such an officer, then all the entries in his confidential file are taken into account—not astray entry, but the entries covering over a number of years.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Are Government aware that because of this system, a large number of officers, who were sympathetic towards the national movement of 1942 and other such movements, are still victimised?

Shri Datar: I am not aware of any victimisation of any person who had

taken part in the national movement. In fact, we have given some concessions to such people.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: My question was this: Because of the system which has been in existence for a long time, as stated by the hon. Minister, is it true that a large number of officers who were sympathetic towards the national movement are still suffering?

Shri Datar: I am not aware of any such case of suffering.

INCOME-TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

*1736. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Law** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 840 on the 9th April, 1956 and state the reasons for the strikingly meagre disposal of cases by the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, Delhi during the fortnight, 1st to 15th January, 1952?

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): The cases heard by a Bench of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal on a particular day are not necessarily finalised and orders passed thereon on the same day or even in the same month. The Delhi Bench of the Tribunal heard 118 cases during the fortnight 1st to 15th January, 1952 (9 court days) and disposed of 34 cases during that period. The work done by that Bench during the said fortnight may be judged by the number of cases heard and not by the number of cases finally disposed of.

Shri Kamath: For how many days during this fortnight did this Tribunal sit to hear cases?

Shri Biswas: I do not know what the hon. Member wants to know. Does he want to know the number of cases heard during the previous fortnight and the succeeding fortnight?

Shri Kamath: The number of days in this fortnight the Tribunal sat to hear cases.

Shri Biswas: Nine court days within that fortnight, from the 1st to the 15th January. I could not tell you what these nine court days were.

Shri Kamath: What is the duration of a court day?

Shri Biswas: A court day is a day on which the Bench sits.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know for how many hours the court sits on a day or on a court day.

Shri Biswas: The usual hours, I suppose, from 10-30 to 5; the usual hours on which any court is expected to sit.

Shri Kamath: The hon. Minister stated that the court sat. Does it mean that the Chairman of the Tribunal also sat or is it only the other Members?

Shri Biswas: The Tribunal sits. Sometimes it delivers judgment then and there in the open court. Otherwise, it reserves judgment and that judgment is considered and passed later on.

Shri Kamath: The hon. Minister had not heard me at all. Did the Chairman also sit on these court days or the other Members only sat?

Shri Biswas: I do not know what my hon. friend means by Chairman. As a matter of fact, there is one Chairman for the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal. The Tribunal sits in different parts at different centres. There is the Tribunal and the Chairman is at Bombay.

Shri Kamath: I am talking about Delhi.

Shri Biswas: There are two Members here, one is a judicial man and the other is an accounts man. They sit together.

Shri Kamath: There is no quorum there, I think.

HEARING-AIDS

*1737. **Shri Bibhuti Mishra:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Seminar on the Education of the deaf held at Mussoori had recommended for the abolition of customs and other duties on such appliances which are component parts

of hearing-aids imported in India from abroad; and

(b) if so, the nature of decision taken thereon?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

I may inform the hon. Member that the Seminar did not recommend for any exemption to the component parts of hearing-aids, but it recommended that individual and group hearing aids should be given exemption from duty.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देशके जो बहरे भाई हैं उन को सहायता के लिये क्या शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने कोई ऐसा उपाय सोचा है जिस से उनके कान में लगाने वाला यंत्र उनको कम कीमत में मिले।

Dr. M. M. Das: I do not know the exact price. But I may inform the hon. Member that our Finance Ministry has already given exemption to individual hearing-aids.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जो कीमत है, उसमे कितनी प्रतिशत कमी होगी ?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is practically free from import duties.

DEVELOPMENT OF HOCKEY

*1738. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to develop Hockey in India; and

(b) if so, the nature of steps taken in the matter so far?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) Hockey is one of the games included in the Government's general Coaching Programme for the Development of Sports in the country.

(b) A three weeks' Hockey Coaching Camp has been organised in Bombay.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether every country has its own national game and also whether Government has considered the development of hockey as the national game of India? If not, what are the reasons?

Dr. M. M. Das: I do not know what is the difference between all these games which are played by the nationals of this country. I think all games in which the nationals of this country take interest are national games.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether India has got superiority in the hockey in the whole world? If that is so, will Government consider the development of this game so that this may be played in the rural and urban areas?

Dr. M. M. Das: It is known to everybody that we have till now been able to maintain our supremacy in hockey over the whole world. Government is taking steps so that we may maintain that supremacy in future.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I know whether this enterprise on the part of the Government in regard to the development of hockey relates to the maintenance of standards also? If the answer is in the affirmative, may I know what steps the Government is taking this year—being the Olympic year, when we have to send a team to Melbourne—to do this? What steps have been taken by the Government for maintaining the standards of the past?

Dr. M. M. Das: So far as Olympic games are concerned, there is a separate organisation. There is the Indian Olympic Association or something like that and it is doing the needful. Government is prepared to give any financial aid if it applies to the Government.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Do I understand from what the hon. Parliamentary Secretary said just now, that, if the Indian Olympic Association or its constituent, the Indian Hockey Federation, were to apply to Government, Government would do everything to finance the visit of the Olympic team?

Dr. M. M. Das: If the application is made, Government is prepared to consider the application.

Shri V. P. Nayar: He said that some steps were being taken by the Central Government for hockey coaching in this country. May I know whether Government has taken the views of one of the greatest hockey players in the country, Shri Jaipal Singh, who first led India's team to victory?

Dr. M. M. Das: Government is prepared to take the advice of every single national in this country who is an expert in hockey.

Shri Kasliwal: Is it not a fact that some of our best hockey coaches are not being employed in the country and that they are being requested to go abroad?

Dr. M. M. Das: We have got no information about it.

I.A.F. MAINTENANCE COMMAND

*1739. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) when the Maintenance Command of the Indian Air-Force was formed;

(b) the special benefits accrued from this formation;

(c) the number of additional staff appointed thereby; and

(d) whether it will be a permanent body?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) In January 1955.

(b) It has considerably improved the standard of maintenance work in the I.A.F.

(c) Taking all the categories together, the total additional staff sanctioned is 208.

(d) Yes, Sir.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether, over and above maintenance work, repair work also is being done here?

Sardar Majithia: I do not know what the hon. Member means really. If he means minor repairs, they are being done here. It is only in the case of overhauling of certain engines, that they are sent to other places.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Who were doing the work that has now been entrusted to this Command?

Sardar Majithia: As I said, the maintenance work and minor repairs are being done. Daily inspections, etc. are always done by the units. It is only other inspections—major inspections—that are being done by the depots which have come under this Command.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether this maintenance work was used to be done by the other combined maintenance services and whether this separate organisation has cost a lot of money whereas the work is negligible?

Sardar Majithia: I should like to give a fuller picture. Formerly the maintenance was under the Air Headquarters. Now, what we have done is to put up a separate Command, just as we have got the Training Command, Operational Command, etc. Similarly, we have got the Maintenance Command. This work is more or less centralised so far as the Air Headquarters is concerned. This Command can give much better attention and keep in touch with them to see that the maintenance is done on the proper lines. It is more or less centralised.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether this separate Maintenance Command which is being created has not been responsible for spending more petrol and other materials?

Sardar Majithia: Certainly not. As I said, maintenance is much better. Therefore, although on the one hand, you have more officers, I take it that the over-all picture will be more economical than previously.

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KHARAGPUR

*1741. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) how many students joined the first post-graduate course in 'Combustion Engineering and Fuel Economy' at the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur;

(b) how many of them have come out successful;

(c) whether it is a fact that all the students were awarded a Scholarship of Rs. 100 each per month;

(d) if so, how much was in all spent for them; and

(e) whether all of them have received gainful employments?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) 10.

(b) 9.

(c) Yes.

(d) Rs. 16,600/-.

(e) Yes.

Shri S. C. Samanta: In answer to the question, I have been informed that all the students have been given work. May I know whether Government has received any representation from any of these students who are lacking employment?

Dr. M. M. Das: I have been provided with a list here. All the successful students have been employed.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I wanted to know whether any representation for employment or otherwise has been received by Government?

Mr. Speaker: What does he mean by 'otherwise'?

Shri S. C. Samanta: About the working there.

Dr. M. M. Das: I have already said that all these nine students are employed. As regards the other pointed question, I want notice.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I want to know whether these nine successful candidates have been appointed in jobs which require the knowledge acquired by them or in any other departments?

Dr. M. M. Das: I find that the concerns like the Sindri Fertilisers, the Calcutta Statistical Institute, the Orissa Cement Factory, etc. have employed these students.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know whether any of the unsuccessful candidates are continuing their studies and whether scholarships are being given to them?

Dr. M. M. Das: Scholarships are being given. As far as unsuccessful candidates are concerned, the question does not arise. Ten students were first admitted. After four months, one went away and all the remaining nine students were declared successful in the final examination and they have been employed in the industrial and other concerns.

LIGNITE DEPOSITS IN MOHINDERGARH DISTRICT

*1743. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any investigation has been undertaken to ascertain the availability of lignite deposits in Mohindergarh District, PEPSU; and

(b) if so, the steps that have been taken by the Centre in this regard in consultation with the Government of PEPSU?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya) (a) The area was investigated by the Geological Survey of India during 1951-52, but no lignite was found.

(b) Does not arise.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether the Government of PEPSU has sent any scheme for the re-survey of this area?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: With a view to preparing a programme of survey, each year a conference is held for consulting the State Governments. In the next month, or perhaps in June, we are going to hold the meeting of the Central Mineral Advisory Board in which the representatives of all State Governments will be invited and the programme for the next year will be considered at that time for finalization.

Shri R. P. Garg: In view of the fact that there is a report made by the Central Government saying that there is some kind of iron ore available in that district, which is richer in quality than what is available in other parts of India, and that a sizable smelting plant can also be put up there, which will go on for hundred years, may I know what are the reasons why a smelting plant has not been put up there by the Central Government?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I have no detailed information whatsoever, but we know that there are some prospects for iron deposits. What amount there is we do not know. With regard to the proposal to have a smelting plant there, that is not the work of this Ministry. It is the Production Ministry which is concerned with it.

Shri R. P. Garg: The area was surveyed by the Government of India and it is a proposal of the Government of India. It is available there, and I do not know how the Minister is saying that he has no information?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: That question may better be put to the Commerce and Industry Ministry or the Ministry of Production.

Shri Bansal: The hon. Minister said that he does not know what quantity of iron ore there is. May I know if he will get a survey made as to the quantity that is available there?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I cannot make any such promises. Unless there is any specific proposal for the working of particular iron mines, the quantitative estimate is a very costly job and it is not worthwhile taking it up without any specific proposal.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether the Governments of Punjab and PEPSU have sent another scheme for an integrated survey of Mohindergarh and Gurgaon Districts as there is a large quantity of iron ore available?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I have not got that information with me at present I will require notice.

राजस्थान में अनुसूचित जातियां और अनुसचित आदिम जातियां

*१७२३. **श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल** : क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) भारत सरकार ने १९५५-५६ में राजस्थान सरकार को अनुसूचित जातियों और अनुसूचित आदिम जातियों की उन्नति के लिए कितनी राशि का अनुदान दिया और राजस्थान के किन-किन डिवीजनों में और किन-किन मदों पर यह राशि व्यय की गई; और

(ख) क्या यह सच है कि वहां पर इस सरकारी सहायता का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है और दलित वर्ग को इन योजनाओं से कोई लाभ नहीं पहुंच रहा है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में मंत्री (श्री दातार): (क) मांगी हुई सूचना के दो विवरण सभा पटल पर रख दिये गये हैं [देखिये परिशिष्ट १०, अनुबन्ध सं १४]

(ख) इस प्रकार का कोई मामला भारत सरकार के सामने नहीं आया ।

श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल : क्या यह सही है कि राजस्थान सरकार की अस्पृशता निवारण योजना के अन्तर्गत जितने पोस्टर और प्रकाशन छपते हैं वे सरकारी अधिकारियों तक ही सीमिती रहते हैं और साधारण जनता तक नहीं पहुंच पाते ?

श्री दातार : यह बात सही नहीं है ।

श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल : क्या म जान सकता हूं कि राजस्थान सरकार नें हरिजनो के लियें कितने जलाशय आदि बनवाये हैं और अन्य पीडितों कों कितनी सहायता दि गयी हैं ?

श्री दातार : इसकी सूचना मेरे पास नहीं है ।

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know what percentage of the total amount is actually spent on welfare work and what amount is spent on the staff?

Shri Datar: I may point out to the hon. Member that a very small amount is spent on the establishment charges; it does not exceed 10 per cent, and the remaining amount is spent over the welfare schemes themselves.

Shri Velayudhan: With regard to answer to part (b) of the question—some complaints had also appeared in the Press—regarding the misuse of Harijan Uplift Fund, may I know whether a particular non-Scheduled Caste man was given about Rs. 75,000 and he has constructed a building for himself with the fund allotted for the uplift of Scheduled Caste people?

Shri Datar: I have no information at all.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, I request that Q. 1733 may be directed to be answered.

Mr. Speaker: I am coming to that.

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: I have been authorised to put questions 1725, 1740 and 1742. They are inter-dependent and of the same nature.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member got the authority?

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Yes, Sir. I have already submitted it.

Mr. Speaker: Has he passed on the authority to the Table Office?

Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Yes. Sir. I have submitted it on the 20th.

Mr. Speaker : I have got here only the name of Shri Krishnacharya Joshi. The hon. Member's name is not here. Anyway, I will find out. Let the question be answered now.

PROMOTION OF HINDI

***1725. Shri Bibhuti Mishra** (*on behalf of* **Pandit D. N. Tiwary**) : Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the total amount sanctioned and advanced to the non-Hindi speaking States has been fully utilised by them in implementing their schemes for the promotion of Hindi; and

(b) whether Government have gauged the effect of the various steps taken by them in respect of the development of Hindi specially in their non-Hindi speaking areas?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि नान-हिन्दी स्पीकींग (अहिन्दी भाषी) प्रान्तों में हिन्दी प्रचार के लिये अब तक सरकार ने कितना रूपया खर्च किया है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: During the year 1954-55 Rs. 2,79,001 was sanctioned for propagation of Hindi in the non-Hindi speaking States, out of which only Rs. 90,000 was paid. During 1955-56, Rs. 5,38,146 was sanctioned for non-Hindi-speaking States, out of which only Rs. 3,74,565 was paid.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि इतनें रुपये सेंक्शन (मंजूर) हूये मगर खर्च में कमी रह गयी है ईसका क्या कारण है । इसके लिय कौनसी एजन्सी (अभिकरण) दोषी है ?

Dr. M. M. Das: The State Governments could not implement the scheme in many cases, and in many cases we did not receive the details of the expenditure of the money that was paid as the first instalment and, therefore, the next instalment was not paid to the State Government.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : साउथ इंडिया (दक्षिण-भारत) में कितना खर्च होना चाहिये और कितना खर्च हुआ ?

Dr. M. M. Das: I have got a list of figures for individual States in South India, but not the figure for South

India as a whole. If you will permit me, Sir, I shall read the figures.

Mr. Speaker: Not necessary.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know what are the non-Hindi-speaking areas as far as this question is concerned?

Dr. M. M. Das: There are 18 States that have been earmarked as non-Hindi-speaking States.

Shri Keshavaiengar: May I know the figures in respect of Mysore States?

Dr. M. M. Das: During 1954-55, the total amount sanctioned in respect of Mysore was Rs. 7645.

Mr. Speaker: Is this sum of Rs. 5 lakhs, which he stated, for the whole of India?

Dr. M. M. Das: Yes, Sir. Then, in 1955-56 for Mysore State the sum sanctioned was Rs. 28,968 and the full amount was paid.

AMENITIES FOR CIVIL AREAS IN CANTONMENT

*1726. **Shri Bhakt Darshan** (*on behalf of* **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi**): Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have accepted the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committees appointed in Cantonments for providing enough space and amenities to the residents of civil areas; and

(b) if so, their main recommendations?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) So far, Government have accepted *in toto* the recommendations of *ad hoc* Committees in respect of two Cantonments, *viz.* Jabalpur and Ferozepore; and partly in respect of Delhi Cantonment.

(b) Brief statements, showing the main recommendations, are placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 15.]

श्री भक्त दर्शन : क्या मंत्रीजी यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जो बाकी और छावनियां है उनके सम्बन्ध में अब तक क्या कार्यवाही की गई है और कब इस बारे में आशा की जा सकती है।

Sardar Majithia: There are only 22 more cantonments left which come under this category. I expect that in about four months' time the whole thing will be decided.

श्री भक्त दर्शन: वे कौनसी खास ऐसी अड़चने हैं जिनकी वजह से अब तक इस मामलेमे देरी हो रही है क्यों की जहां तक मुझे मालूम है उन छावनियों ने सर्व सम्मति से सिफारिशे की थी, क्या इस बारे मे शीघ्रता की जायेगी।

Sardar Majithia: As I said, the *ad hoc* Committees in certain cases went beyond their terms of reference. Therefore, they are being carefully examined and that is why there is delay.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : विवरण से मालूम होता है कि दिल्ली छावनी के सम्बन्ध मे जो सिफारिशे की गयी थी उनमें से बहुत कम मंजूर की गयी हैं। क्या मै जान सकता हूं कि सिफारिशे नम्बर २, ३, ४, को न मानने का क्या कारण है ?

Sardar Majithia: It was not agreed to by the Army Authorities. They said that it will not be quite in the interest of the Army to extend it.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Was it their sweet discretion, or were there some reasons which demanded it?

Sardar Majithia: There was no question of sweet discretion. Reasons were advanced; they were carefully considered by the Ministry and we agreed to it.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

CENTRAL OVER SEAS SCHOLARSHIPS

*1728. **Dr. Satyawadi:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) number of candidates selected for 1956-57 under the Central Over Seas Scholarship Scheme meant for teachers of Government Colleges and Universities etc; and

(b) the names of the States to which they belong?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) Twentythree. Award of two more scholarships will be announced shortly. These scholarships are for teachers in universities/comparable institutions and colleges.

(b) Andhra 5, Assam 1, Bihar 1, Bombay 2, Hyderabad 1, Madhya Pradesh 1, Mysore 1, Punjab 1, Orissa 2, Travancore-Cochin 1, Uttar Pradesh 3 and West Bengal 4.

आय-कर अपवंचक व्यक्ति

*१७२६. **श्री. के० सी० सोधिया :** क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) वर्ष १९५४–५५ और १९५५–५६ में आय-कर विभाग ने आय-कर छिपाने वाले कितने व्यक्तियों को ढूंढ निकाला :

(ख) इन में कितने व्यक्तियों पर आय-कर लगाया गया और इस प्रकार कुल कितना आय-कर लगाया गया ; और

(ग) इनमें से कितने व्यक्तियों की वार्षिक आय १०,००० रुपये या उससे अधिक थी ?

राजस्व और असैनिक व्यय मंत्री (श्री एम० सी० शाह : (क) से (ग) जो सूचना मांगी गयी है वह प्रकाशित अभिलेखों या संकलित आंकड़ों से नहीं मिलती और इसे प्राप्त करने में जितना समय लगेगा और जितना परिश्रम करना पड़ेगा वह प्राप्त होनेवाले परिणाम की अपेक्षा कही अधिक होगा ।

Union Public Service Commission

*1733. **Shri Punnoose:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Union Public Service Commission had in 1954-55, approved the appointments to higher posts in the various Ministries and attached offices of the Government of India, of candidates who were rejected for lower posts by the Commission on previous occasions;

(b) if so, the number of such cases;

(c) the names of such candidates, their designations and the offices in which they are employed and their qualifications; and

(d) the reasons for such approvals?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (d). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Training in Oil Prospecting

*1735. **Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some candidates are proposed to be selected in the near future to be sent abroad for training in oil prospecting;

(b) if so, the number of candidates to be selected for the first batch; and

(c) whether preference will be given to those States where prespecting works have already been started or likely to be started?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). Training facilities for 14 persons in USSR under the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration Programme have been asked for. Six of these persons are at present employed in the Geological Survey of India and the remaining eight in the Oil and Natural Gas Directorate.

(c) Does not arise.

Grants for Propagation of Hindi

*1740. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government attaches certain conditions while sanctioning grants to the non-Government organisations propagating Hindi in the States; and

(b) whether these organisations also receive additional grants from the State Governments?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) There is no ban on these organisations to receive grants from the State Governments also.

PROPAGATION OF HINDI

***1742. Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 581 on the 6th December, 1955 and state:

(a) whether any reports have been received from the Regional Committees set up by the Hindi Shiksha Samiti; and

(b) if so, the nature thereof?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

EDUCATION SCHEME FOR ANDAMANS

1436. Shri Ram Krishan: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the scheme of educational improvement in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands during the Second Five Year Plan has been finalised;

(b) if so, the total amount to be spent on it; and

(c) the special features thereof?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das: (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X annexure No. 16].

TRIPURA POLICE FORCE

1437. Shri Biren Dutt: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the strength of Police force in Tripura;

(b) whether there is any Police Training Centre in the State; and

(c) if not, whether Government propose to start one ?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) 1727.

(b) No.

(c) No.

JUMIAS REHABILITATION

1438. Shri Biren Dutt: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) what is the area of land given to Jumias (Tribals) of Tripura uptill now under Jumia rehabilitation scheme;

(b) the number of families which have received land; and

(c) the amount of money given as grant to them?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) 6262 acres.

(b) 2287 families.

(c) Rs. 7,50,000.

SCHEDULED TRIBES OF MADHYA PRADESH

1439. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the development projects and Welfare Schemes for the Scheduled Tribes of (i) Betul district (ii) Chhindwara District of Madhya Pradesh separately and the amount sanctioned for each of them during 1954-55 and 1955-56; and

(b) the schemes and projects proposed for 1956-57?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House when received.

POST-MATRIC SCHOLARSHIPS FOR SCHEDULED CASTES

1440. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Scheduled Castes students of Hoshangabad District of Madhya Pradesh who applied for the

post-Matric scholarships under the post-Matric Scholarship scheme during 1955-56; and

(b) the names of such applicants who have been awarded scholarships?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) 15.

(b) A statement showing the names of the 14 candidates awarded scholarships is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 17.]

POST-MATRIC SCHOLARSHIPS FOR SCHEDULED TRIBES

1441. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Scheduled Tribes students of Hoshangabad district, Madhya Pradesh who applied for the post-matric scholarships under the post-matric scholarship scheme during 1955-56; and

(b) the names of such applicants who have been awarded such scholarships?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) and (b). As there are no Scheduled Tribes in the Hoshangabad district of Madhya Pradesh, the questions do not arise.

STATE BANK OF INDIA

1442. Shri Kamath: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of places in Hoshangabad District, (Madhya Pradesh), where branches and pay offices (separately) of the State Bank of India exist;

(b) whether such branches or pay offices are proposed to be opened in the same district during 1956-57 also; and

(c) if so, the names of such places where they will be opened?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) There are two branches and six pay offices and sub-pay offices of the State Bank of India in Hoshangabad District as follows:

Branches

1. Hoshangabad 2. Harda.

Pay offices and sub-pay offices:

1. Gadarwara 2. Narasimhapur 3. Gotegaon 4. Itarsi. 5. Kareli 6. Pipariya.

(b) and (c). The only proposal so far approved is the upgrading of the pay office at Narasimhapur into a full-fledged branch.

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

1443. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the main additional schemes for the education of the Blind for 1956-57; and

(b) the amount earmarked for this purpose?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) and (b). A statement giving the requisite information is attached. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 18.]

सैनिक संगीत पाठशाला, पंचमढ़ी

१४४४. श्री भक्त दर्शन : क्या **प्रतिरक्षा** मंत्री सैनिक संगीत विद्यालय, पचमढ़ी द्वारा अब तक तैयार किये गये महत्वपूर्ण गानों और ध्वनियों की रूपरेखा सभा पटल पर रखने की कृपा करेंगे ?

प्रतिरक्षा उपमंत्री (सरदार मजीठिया): निम्न लिखित सभा-पटल पर रख दिये गये हैं :–

(१) विद्यालय द्वारा तैयार की गयी ६७ ध्वनियों के शीर्षक ।

(२) इन ६७ ध्वनियों में से चुने गये २४ गानों के पूरे पद ।

(३) कुल ६७ ध्वनियों में से १७ ध्वनियों के शीर्षक, जिनकी स्वर लिपियां सैनिक बैण्डों द्वारा प्रयोग में लाने के लिये छापी जा चुकी हैं । [पुस्तकालय में रखे गये, देखिये सं० एस १४६।५६]

FIRE ARMS

1445. Chaudhuri Muhammed Shaffee: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state the number of fire arms, *i.e.*, "revolvers and rifles" for which licences were cancelled by Government from the 1st September, 1955 to the 31st March, 1956?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): A statement showing the requisite information in respect of the States from which replies have so far been received is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 19.]

Information in respect of other States will be laid on the Table of the House when received.

PERMITS FOR JAMMU AND KASHMIR

1446. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state the number of persons who applied for permits for entry into the Jammu and Kashmir State from the 1st December, 1955 to the end of February, 1956?

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): 35,498 excluding Bihar figures which have not yet been received.

MANGANESE ORE

1447. Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state the total output of manganese ore in India during 1955 as compared to the total output in 1954?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): The total output of Manganese Ore during the year 1954 was 14,13,068 tons. The production during the year 1955 is estimated as 15,20,316 tons, the figure being provisional as final returns for all mines have not yet been received.

URBAN WELFARE FAMILY PROJECTS

1448. Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of places where Urban Welfare Family Projects have been opened so far; and

(b) a brief account of the progress made?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) Delhi, Hyderabad, Vijayawada and Poona.

(b) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPARTMENT FOR PUNJAB AND PEPSU

1449. Sardar Iqbal Singh:
Sardar Akarpuri:
Shri Ram Krishan:

Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state whether any financial aid and technical co-operation is being extended to the Punjab and Pepsu Governments for establishing an independent Geological Survey Department for the States?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): No, Sir. The only proposal was a request from the Pepsu Government to the Planning Commission for allocation of a sum of Rs. 2·14 lakhs for expenditure on purchase of equipment to be hired to owners of small mines and quarries on a no-profit-no-loss basis, and for providing some staff. This has been agreed to in full. No financial aid or technical co-operation has been asked for or offered to the Punjab and Pepsu Governments for an independent Geological Survey Department. The Geological Survey of India will carry out exploration in these areas as in others.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

1450. Chaudhuri Muhammed Shaffee: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Central Government employees, State-wise in India, who opted for India, before partition, but were not allowed to continue their services in India;

(b) the reasons therefor;

(c) the number State-wise, of such employees, who have been allowed to rejoin their service in India later on;

(d) the number of such employees whose cases are still pending;

(e) whether any amount as pay or compensation will be paid to those who have been reinstated; and

(f) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): There is no such case.

(a) Every Central Government servant who had opted for India has been allowed to continue in the service of the Government of India.

(b) to (f). Do not arise.

MILITARY DAIRY FARMS

1451. Th. Lakshman Singh Charak: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Military Dairy Farms in India in operation from 1952 to 1955, year-wise,

(b) whether there was profit or loss in trading during the said period;

(c) the invested capital on each of the farms; and

(d) the total strength of the herd in each farm year-wise?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) A statement showing the number of military dairy farms in operation from 1952 to 1955 is attached. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 20.]

(b) During the three years of 1952-53, 1953-54 and 1954-55 there was profit in trading. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 20.]

(c) A statement showing the invested capital of each of the farms during the period 1952 to 1955 is attached. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 20.]

(d) A statement showing the total strength of the herds in each farm during the period 1952 to 1955 is attached. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 20.]

माल का छपे-चोरी ले जाया जाना

२४५२ श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल : क्या **वित्त** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि फरवरी, १९५६ में गंगानगर सीमा पर अफीम की एक बड़ी मात्रा पकड़ी गई थी जब कि इसे भारत से पाकिस्तान में चोरी से ले जाया जा रहा था ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो कितनी मात्रा पकड़ी गई थी और उसका मूल्य कितना था ;

(ग) इस सम्बन्ध में कितने आदमी गिरफ्तार किये गये और उनके विरुद्ध क्या कार्यवाही की गई ;

(घ) क्या यह भी सच है कि गत वर्ष हरिजनों के ७,००० रुपये की कीमत के बारह ऊंट गंगानगर जिले के गांवों से चुरा लिये गये थे और पाकिस्तान ले जाये गये थे ; और

(ङ) यदि हां, तो सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

राजस्व और प्रतिरक्षा व्यय मंत्री (श्री अरुण चन्द्र गुह) : (क) तथा (ख) भू सीमाशुल्क अधिकारियों ने राजस्थान के गंगानगर जिले के हिन्दुमलकोट स्थान पर फरवरी, १९५६ में ८,२०० रुपये की २०–½ सेर अफीम पकड़ी थी।

(ग) यह अफीम दो आदमियों के पास से पकड़ी गयी जिन्हें गिरफ्तार करके राजस्थान पुलिस के हवाले कर दिया गया। इन आदमियों पर अफीम कानून की धारा ९ और पारपत्र कानून की धारा ३ के अनुसार मुकदमा चलाया जा रहा है।

(घ) तथा (ङ). इस सम्बन्ध में भू-सीमाशुल्क या केन्द्रीय उत्पादन-शुल्क विभाग के कागजपत्रों से कोई पता नहीं चलता।

ENGINEERING COLLEGE AT PATIALA

1453. Shri Ram Krishan: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Pepsu had approached the Central

Government with a request to establish an Engineering College at Patiala; and

(b) if so, the result thereof?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) and (b). The State Government have submitted a scheme for the establishment of an Engineering College in Patiala and have sought the approval of the All India Council for Technical Education to it.

The scheme is being examined.

आयुध-सामग्री कारखाने

१४५४ **श्री के० सी० सोधिया** : क्या **प्रतिरक्षा** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि आयुध-सामग्री कारखानों में पीतल की पत्तियां बड़े पैमाने पर बनाई जाती हैं ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो वर्ष १९५४–५५ में ऐसी पत्तियों का कुल कितनी मात्रा में निर्माण किया गया ;

(ग) इन कारखानों में ऐसी पत्तियों की कुल कितनी मात्रा का उपयोग किया गया और शेष पत्तियां किस प्रकार के कामों में लाई गई ;

(घ) क्या वहां पर पीतल की ढलाई का काम भी होता है ; और

(ङ) यदि हां, तो ऐसे कारखानों के नाम क्या हैं और १९५४–५५ में पीतल की कितनी मात्रा की ढलाई की गई ?

प्रतिरक्षा उपमंत्री (सरदार मजीठिया) : (क) कुछ आर्डनैन्स फैक्टरियों में पीतल की पत्तियां पर्याप्त मात्रा में बनाई जाती हैं ।

(ख) लगभग २,००० टन पीतल की पत्तियां।

(ग) १०० टन पीतल की पत्तियां फैक्टरियों द्वारा उपयोग में लाई गई और बाकी बेच दी गई ।

(घ) जी हां ।

(ङ) ढलाई का काम निम्न-लिखित फैक्टरियों में होता हैं :—

मेटल और स्टील फ़ैक्टरी, ईशापुर

गन और शेल फ़ैक्टरी, कासीपुर

गन कैरेज फ़ैक्टरी, जबलपुर

आर्डनैन्स फ़ैक्टरी, कानपुर

हारनैस और सैडलरी फ़ैक्टरी, कानपुर

सन् १९५४–५५ के अन्तर्गत कुल १५० टन की ढलाई की गई ।

राइफलें

१४५५ **श्री के० सी० सोधिया** : क्या **प्रतिरक्षा** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि—

(ख) पुरानी राइफलों के स्थान पर नई राईफलोंके बदले जाने के बाद पुरानी राइफलों का उपयोग किस प्रकार होता है ; और

(ख) पिछले तीन वर्षों में राइफलों की तबदीली कब की गई ?

प्रतिरक्षा उपमंत्री (सरदार मजीठिया) : (क) जब पुरानी राइफलों के बदल में नई राइफलें प्रतिस्थापित की जाती हैं तो पुरानी राइफलें आर्डनैन्स फ़ैक्टरीयों में भेज दी जाती हैं, वहां पर इनके प्रत्येक भाग अलग-अलग कर दिये जाते हैं । इस प्रकार अलग किये गये प्रत्येक भागों का निरीक्षण किया जाता है और उन्हें कामयोग्य, मरम्मतयोग्य, तथा बेकार श्रेणियों में बांटा जाता है । कामयोग्य तथा मरम्मतयोग्य भाग अतिरिक्त भागों की मांग की पूर्ति करने तथा फ़ैक्टरीयों द्वारा मरम्मत करने एवं नक़ली राइफलों के उत्पादन के उपयोग में लाये जाते हैं । बेकार भागों को कूड़ा समझकर बेच दिया जाता ।

(ख) यदि वार्षिक निरीक्षण के समय कोई राइफल प्रतिमान से निम्न कोटी की पाई जाती है तो उस के स्थान पर नई राइफल प्रतिस्थापित करने के लिये कहा जाता है । यह एक वार्षिक प्रक्रिया है, अतः पुरानी राइफलों को बड़े पैमाने-पर प्रति-स्थापित करने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता ।

Manipur Officers' Pay Scales

1456. Shri Rishang Keishing: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Chief Commissioner of Manipur in exercise of the Fundamental Rules No. 35, has withheld the minimum pay scale entitled to newly appointed Manipuri Officers; and

(b) if so, the reasons and the number of Manipuri officers affected?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) and (b). The required information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House when received.

JANATA COLLEGES

1457. Dr. Satyawadi: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state the programme of opening of Janata Colleges for the year 1956-57?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): It is intended to continue in the year 1956-57, the same programme for opening the Janata Colleges as was being implemented in 1955-56, except that they will not be required to be located in any particular area.

EDUCATIONAL FILMS

1458. Dr. Satyawadi: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state the subject matter of the films proposed by the Ministry of Education to be produced during 1956-57 under different schemes of education?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 21.]

DEVELOPMENT OF BACKWARD AREAS

1459. { Sardar Iqbal Singh: Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any directive or instructions have been issued to the State Governments for giving special consideration to the development of backward areas in the schemes suggested for the Second Five Year Plan; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) No. Sir, Development of backward areas is the responsibility of the State Governments. State Governments are themselves fully alive to the special needs of these areas and have provided for them to the maximum extent possible in the schemes included in the Second Five Year Plan.

(b) Does not arise.

भारत का सर्वक्षण विभाग

१४६०. श्री के० सी० सोधिया : क्या **प्राकृतिक संसाधन और वैज्ञानिक गवेषणा** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या भारत के सर्वेक्षण विभाग द्वारा तयार किये गये मानचित्रों तथा नक्शों को दशमिक प्रणाली में बदला जा रहा है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसे पूरा करने में कितना समय लगने की संभावना है ;

(ग) क्या इस कार्य के लिये नई शाखा खोली गई ह अथवा कर्मचारियों की संख्या में वृद्धि की गई ह ;

(घ) यदि हां, तो नियुक्त किये गये अतिरिक्त कर्मचारियों की संख्या कितनी है ; और

(ङ) नये मानचित्र कब तक उपलब्ध हो जायेंगे ?

प्राकृतिक संसाधन मंत्री (श्री क० डी० मालवीय : (क) ,(ख) और (ङ) अक्टूबर १९५६ से समस्त १,२५,००० मानचित्र विस्तृत दशमिक प्रणाली के आधार पर तयार किय जायेंगे । वर्त्तमान मानचित्रों में किया गया परिवर्तन व्यवहार में नहीं लाया जा सकता क्योंकि एक नवीन प्रणाली म इसक पूर्णरूपण परिवर्तित होने में लगभग ३० से ४० वर्ष लगने का अनुमान है । फिर भी, निकट भविष्य में किसी स्थान के वर्णन से सम्बन्धित वर्तमान मानचित्रों पर दशमिक रेखांकित जाली (Matric grid) को छापने तथा इनके किनारों पर दशमिक पैमानों को दर्शित करने का प्रस्ताव किया गया है ।

(ग) जी, नहीं ।

(घ) यह प्रश्न यहां नहीं उठता ।

CENTRAL SECRETARIAT

1461. Shri Radha Raman: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a certain quota of the permanent vacancies in the Assistant's Grade was reserved for the permanent III Division Clerks recruited in the Central Secretariat on the results of the late Federal Public Service Commission's Examination before the introduction of the Central Secretariat Service;

(b) if so, the number of vacancies so reserved;

(c) the reasons why some representation was not given to them in the above scheme as in the regular Temporary Establishment of Assistants; and

(d) whether the question of giving some vacancies to them is being considered now?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (c). The attentiton of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to the following Questions:

(1) Starred Question No. 1206 on the 18th March 1955; and

(2) Starred Question No. 1581 on the 28th March 1955.

(d) No.

RESEARCH PROJECT CENTRES

1462. {Shri Radha Raman: / Shri Shivananjappa:

Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Board and the Governing Body of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research have suggested opening of new Research Project Centres at the Universities;

(b) if so, where these will be started; and

(c) other details of the recommendations of the Governing Body of the Council?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) to (c). A statement giving the required information is attached. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 22.]

ALL INDIA SERVICES

1464. Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of personnel belonging to the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service separately against whom disciplinary action of any kind was taken in 1955; and

(b) the details of the punishments given?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):

(a)

I.A.S. (including I.C.S.)	4
I.P.S.	3
TOTAL	7

(b) The information is as follows:—

	I.A.S.	I.P.S.
Censured	2	1
Increment withheld	..	2
Probation terminated and reverted to state Service	1	
Displeasure conveyed		
TOTAL	4	3

ORDNANCE FACTORIES, KIRKEE

1465. {Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: / Shri Gadilingana Gowd:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there was a strike by about 15,000 workers of Ordnance Factories in Kirkee on the 2nd April, 1956;

(b) the period for which the strike lasted; and

(c) the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) 3326 workers of Ammunition Factory, High Explosive Factory and Technical Development Establishment (Ammunition) at Kirkee, observed a tools-down strike on the 2nd April, 1956.

(b) The strike lasted for two hours.

(c) The strike was observed by the workers in protest against (i) notices of discharge served on some of the employees of Ordnance Factory, Wadala, which is being closed down and (ii) the decision that for purposes of retrenchment, only those industrial employees who are on scales of pay commencing at Rs. 60 or more will be considered as skilled categories.

COMMUNITY ORGANISERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS

1466. Shri Deogam: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to refer to the replies given to Starred Questions No. 140 on the 23rd March, 1955 and No. 1686 on the 24th December, 1954 and state:

(a) the reasons why the States of Bihar and West Bengal did not train up Community Organisers and other types of social workers from amongst the educated youths belonging to the Tribal Communities as visualised in Chapter 37 of the First Five Year Plan; and

(b) the steps the Central Government have taken to ask these two State Governments to discharge their special duties towards the Tribal Communities as laid down in the First Five Year Plan and in article 46 of our Constitution?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

HISTORY OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

1467. { Sardar Iqbal Singh: Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state the progress made so far in preparing an authentic history of Indian Independence Struggle of 1857?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): The writing of the History has been entrusted to Dr. S. N. Sen, Ex-Vice Chancellor of Delhi University and he is required to complete the manuscript before the 30th June, 1956 so that it may be published on the 10th May, 1957.

DEPORTATION OF FOREIGNERS

1468. { Sardar Iqbal Singh: Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any nationals of foreign States have been deported from India since August, 1955;

(b) if so, their number;

(c) the names of the countries to which they belonged; and

(d) the grounds of their deportation from India?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (d). The information asked for is given below:—

Number	Nationality	Grounds for deportation
11	5 Tibetans	Undesirable social activities.
	2 Lebanese	Undesirable foreigners. Smugglers.
	1 Austrian	Undesirable foreigner
	1 Chinese Turk	Undesirable foreigner
	1 Tribal Pathan	Undesirable foreigner
	1 Iranian	Undesirable foreigner;

The above figures do not include any foreigners who may have been deported by State Governments under their own powers.

IRON ORE DEPOSITS

1469. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Natural Resources and Scientific Research** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there are iron ore deposits in Pepsu State excluding Mohindergarh District; and

(b) if so, whether any survey has been carried out recently?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) and (b). The Geological Survey of India have no information regarding iron ore in Pepsu outside Mohindergarh District.

JOINT FINANCIAL CORPORATION FOR DELHI AND PUNJAB

1470. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state the progress made so far towards the formation of a Joint Financial Corporation for Delhi and Punjab?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): Certain agreements have been reached between the Governments of Punjab and Delhi to enlarge the scope of the Punjab Financial Corporation so as to convert it into a Joint Financial Corporation for the States of Punjab and Delhi. Further progress can be made only after the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951 has been amended to enable the establishment of Joint Financial Corporations by more than one State. The amending Bill is expected to be introduced in the Parliament soon.

GRANTS FOR LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

1471. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state the amount of grants proposed to be sanctioned to the States for the development of the library movement and establishment of a library service during 1956-57?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): No separate amount has been earmarked for the purpose. The grants which the Centre may give will largely depend on the proposals sent by the State Governments and will be met out of the total provision of Rupees seven crores made for 1956-57 for all schemes of Basic and Social Education.

STATE BANK OF INDIA

1472. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state the number of applicants who have so far applied for the transfer of shares of the State Bank of India to them in lieu of compensation payable for the shares of the Imperial Bank?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): Against a total of 2,53,125 shares of the State Bank of India, of the face value of Rs. 100 each, available for transfer to the share-holders of Imperial Bank, applications have been received from 1,228 shareholders (from out of a total of 10,728 shareholders) for a transfer to them of 44,306 shares of the State Bank, in lieu of compensation in the form of cash and/or G.P. Notes.

RE-EMPLOYMENT OF I.C.S. OFFICERS

1473. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:**
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of retired I.C.S. Officers re-employed by the Government of India as on the 31st January, 1956; and

(b) the offices they are holding at present?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) 10.

(b) (i) Advisers, Planning Commission. (Two)

(ii) Governor, Reserve Bank of India. (One)

(iii) Chairman, Tungabhadra, Project. (One)

(iv) Deputy Governors, Reserve Bank of India. (Two)

(v) Adviser to the Rajpramukh Travancore-Cochin. (One)

(vi) Court Liquidator, Calcutta High Court. (One)

(vii) Deputy Director, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. (One)

(viii) Chairman of the Committee enquiring into the System of Banking in Travancore-Cochin. (One)

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS

1474. { **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** **Sardar Akarpuri:**

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of International Voluntary Work Camps that are working in India;

(b) their number during the current year; and

(c) whether Government are affording any facility to these camps?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) to (c). Attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reply given to Starred Question No. 703 asked by Shri Radha Raman on 13-8-55. The position remains the same.

ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO INDIA

1475. { **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** **Sardar Akarpuri:**

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that many cases of illegal entry into India of persons without valid travel documents have been detected recently on the Indo-Pakistan border; and

(b) if so, the number of such cases that were reported during the year 1956 so far?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

INDIAN CITIZENSHIP

1476. { **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** **Sardar Akarpuri:**

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state the number of Pakistani Nationals who have applied for permanent citizenship of India during 1955?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): The Citizenship Act, 1955, which provides for acquisition of India Citizenship, came into force only on the 30th December 1955. The question of Pakistani nationals applying for Indian Citizenship during the year 1955 does not therefore arise. However, the total number of Pakistani nationals who have applied for permanent resettlement in India since the 15th October, 1952 when the passport and Visa system for travel between India and Pakistan came into force, with a view to acquiring Indian Citizenship in the long run, is 8846.

REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE EDUCATION MINISTRY

1477. Shri S. C. Samanta: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the functions of the Regional Offices of the Ministry at Calcutta and Bombay;

(b) when they were started;

(c) whether there is any possibility of opening other regional offices in any part of the country; and

(d) if so, when and where?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) to (d). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 23.]

TRIPURA STATE BANK LIMITED

1478. Shri Biren Dutt: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any representation has been received from the Share-holders of the Tripura State Bank Limited to convert this bank into a branch of Central Co-operative Bank; and

(b) if so, the steps Government propose to take in this matter?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The representation was considered by Government in consultation with the Reserve Bank and the suggestion made in the representation has not appeared to be feasible. The future of the Tripura State Bank Limited is still under consideration.

ORDNANCE FACTORY, JUBBALPORE

1479. Shri Madiah Gowda: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the timber supplied by the Contractors to the Ordnance Factory, Jubbalpore has been found to be of inferior quality;

(b) the amount involved in the transaction; and

(c) whether any action has been taken against the persons concerned?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) One such case of supply of inferior quality timber in 1952 to Gun Carriage Factory, Jubbalpore, was detected.

(b) The amount of the contract was about Rs. 55 lakhs. This figure does not, however, refer to the loss to Government. The total amount of loss involved is not available as the case is still under investigation by the Government and the Special Police Establishment.

(c) Four Officers (two gazetted and two non-gazetted), who were suspected to be involved in this case, are under suspension from service since 15-10-1954. Further action will depend on the final result of the Special Police Establishment investigation.

AMERICAN AID

1480. Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of aid in terms of Indian currency received from U.S.A. till the 31st March, 1956 in the form of machinery and capital goods; and

(b) the cost incurred and proposed to be incurred in the near future for the purchase of spare parts for the said machinery and capital goods?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): (a) Approximately Rs. 77·54 crores.

(b) In accordance with the normal practice, spare parts, if needed, are imported along with the equipment and machinery to the extent of 10% of the cost thereof. No information is available as to the additional costs that may have been incurred or are proposed to be incurred in future for additional spare parts. The requirements of additional spare parts, if any, will be provided in the usual manner by the authorities in charge of the numerous projects of the Central and the State Governments for which the machinery and equipment were imported.

COMMUNITY ORGANISERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS

1481. Shri Deogam: Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Community Organisers and other types of Social Workers

from amongst the educated youths of the Tribal Communities were trained during the Plan period, as envisaged in para. 31 of Chapter 37 in the First Five Year Plan;

(b) if so, their number years-wise and State-wise;

(c) the number of those who were employed after training year-wise and State-wise; and

(d) the posts to which they were appointed and their pay scales?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): (a) to (d). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

Central Detective Training School

1482. { Sardar Iqbal Singh: Shri Ram Krishan:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the schemes for the establishment of Central Detective Training School and the Central Finger Print Bureau have been finalised; and

(b) the main features of the scheme?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) Yes.

(b) The Central Detective Training School will impart training in scientific detection and investigation of crime.

The Central Finger Print Bureau will maintain records of finger prints of criminals and habitual offenders with a view to help in their identification, and will undertake comparison of finger prints for the purpose of police investigations. The Bureau will also maintain contacts with foreign institutions of the same type.

Canteen Stores Department

1483. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the employees of Canteen Stores Department are treated as regular Government employees; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) No.

(b) The Canteen Stores Department (India) is not a Government Department but is an undertaking under the control of the Ministry of Defence. The Department is run on commercial lines for the benefit of the Service personnel. The employees of the Canteen Stores Department (India) are paid out of the Department's own funds and not from public funds. Hence, the employees of the department are not regular Government employees.

International Bank and Monetary Fund

1484. Shri Punnoose: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of candidates recommended from the Ministry of Finance so far for training with the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

(b) the results thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House giving the information. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 24.]

साहित्यकार और कलाकार

१४८५. श्री राम शंकर लाल : क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) अब तक किन-किन महान कलाकारों को उनके आपदकाल में वित्तीय सहायता दी गई ; और

(ख) प्रत्येक को कितनी-कितनी धनराशि दी गई ?

शिक्षा मंत्री के सभासचिव (डॉ० एम० एम० दास) : (क) तथा (ख) एक विवरण सभा पटल पर दिया गया ह [देखिये परिशिष्ठ १० अनबन्ध सं २५]

I.A.S. AND I.P.S. TRAINEES

1486. Dr. Satyawadi: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of I. A. S. and I. P. S. trainees who completed training during 1955; and

(b) the number of those who are under training at present?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I.A.S....41 and I.P.S.....45.

(b) Fifty I.A.S. Probationers have just finished training and the next batch of Probationers will join the I.A.S. Training School on the 1st May 1956.

Thirtytwo I.P.S. Probationers are under training.

बुनियादी शिक्षा के विद्यालय

१४८७. श्री राम शंकर लाल : क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) १९५५-५६ में कितने आरम्भिक विद्यालयों को (राज्यवार) बुनियादी विद्यालयों में बदला गया ; और

(ख) उसी अवधि में, इस प्रयोजन के लिये केन्द्र ने प्रत्येक राज्य को कितनी कितनी धनराशि दी ?

शिक्षा मंत्री के सभासचिव (डॉ० एम० एम० दास) : (क) सूचना उपलब्ध नहीं है । राज्य सरकारो को इसके भेजने में कुछ समय लगेगा ।

(ख) एक विवरण सभा-पटल पर रख दिया गया है [देखिये परिशिष्ठ १०, अनुबन्ध सं २६]

RAJASTHAN BANKS

1488. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the banks which have been recognised as State Associated Banks in Rajasthan; and

(b) whether it is a fact that Rajasthan Bank employees have submitted a memorandum for their inclusion in the list of such banks?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) The following are the major State-associated banks in Rajasthan according to the list given in paragraph 2, Chapter 34 of the General Report of the All India Rural Credit Survey:

1. The Bank of Bikaner Ltd.
2. The Bank of Jaipur Ltd.
3. The Bank of Rajasthan Ltd.

(b) Representations have been received from the employees of the Bank of Rajasthan requesting that the Government of India should take over the Bank of Rajasthan along with other State-associated banks in Rajasthan.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS NEAR BABINA

1489. Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any lands near Babina District Jhansi, U.P. have been acquired by Government;

(b) if so, their area;

(c) number of owners affected; and

(d) whether they have been given compensation or allotted alternative lands?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Sardar Majithia): (a) Yes.

(b) 23,029·76 acres.

(c) About 3,500.

(d) (i) Compensation is under assessment by the Collector of Jhansi. To avoid hardship to the landowners 'on account' payments subsequently to be adjusted against the cost of acquisition, have been authorised.

(ii) Our information is that alternative lands are being allotted to the affected people by the U.P. Government.

कालिदास की कृतियाँ

१४९०. श्री आर० सी० शर्मा : क्या शिक्षा मंत्री ९ अप्रैल, १९५६ को तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या १२६७ क उत्तर क सम्बन्ध म यह बतान की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) साहित्य अकादमी द्वारा अभी कालिदास की किन-किन कृतियों का अनुवाद किया जाना शष है ; और

(ख) यह कार्य कब तक पूरा होने की संभावना है ?

शिक्षा मंत्री के सभासचिव (डॉ० एम० एम० दास) : (क) तथा (ख) महाकवि कालिदास की ,नम्नलिखित कृतियों का आलोचनात्मक संशोधन साहित्य अकादमी द्वारा हो रहा है और इसी वर्ष इस कार्य के पूर्ण होने की आशा है ।

१. शकुन्तला
२. मालविकाग्निमित्र
३. विक्रमोर्वशी
४. कुमारसम्भव
५. रघुवंश
६. ऋतुसम्हार

मध्य भारत को अनुदान

१४९१. श्री आर० सी० शर्मा : क्या **गृह-कार्य** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) अस्पृश्यता निवारण के लिये १९५५–५६ में मध्य भारत सरकार को कितनी सहायता दी गई;

(ख) यह रकम किस तरीके से व्यय की गई ; और

(ग) शेष रकम, यदि कछ ह, तो कितनी ह ?

गृह-काय मंत्रालय मे मंत्री (श्री दातार) : (क) १९५५–५६ में मध्य भारत राज्य को ४·०७ लाख रुपय की रकम स्वीकार कर क दी गई ।

(ख) सहायक अनुदान की स्वीकृत और सितम्बर १९५५ क अन्त तक खच की गई रकम का विवरण सभा-पटल पर रख दिया गया हैं [देखियें परिशिष्ठ १०, अनुबन्ध सं २७] १ अक्तुबर,१९५५ से ३१ मार्च,१९५६ तक की सूचना अभी तक प्राप्त नहीं हुई है ।

(ग) १९५५–५६ का लेखा अभी पूरा नहीं हुआ ह । इसलिये यह सचना इतनी जल्दी नहीं दी जा सकती ।

Employment in Foreign Missions

1492. Shri N. M. Lingam: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1535 on the 7th September, 1955 and state:

(a) whether permission of the Government was obtained by the Officers of the Government of India who allowed their wives to take up employment in foreign missions in New Delhi; and

(b) the name of foreign missions in which the employees are working?

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) No formal permission is required in such cases; but under executive instructions issued by Government in June 1955, a Government servant whose wife or dependent intends to take employment under a foreign mission in India should intimate the fact to Government in the Ministry concerned. On receipt of the intimation the Ministry concerned should consider whether the acceptance of the employment is open to any objection and, if so, prohibit such employment. Government are not aware of any case in which these instructions have been ignored.

(b) U.K. High Commission, U.K. Trade Commission, Canadian High

Commission, U. S. Embassy, U.S. Educational Foundation, United States Information Service, German Embassy.

ASSAY DEPARTMENT

1493. Shri S. C. Samanta: Will the Minister of **Finance** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposed laboratory for the scientific study of metals and alloys in the Assay Departments has started working; and

(b) if so, the useful informations received from them up-to-date?

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): (a) and (b). Assay offices are already equipped with an up-to-date laboratory for assay purposes and also for taking up the investigation of coinage problems as and when they arise. So there is no question of starting any new laboratory.

DAILY DIGEST

[*Wednesday, 25th April, 1956*]

COLUMNS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

S.Q. No.	*Subject*	
1718	Cantonment Lands	2837-2839
1719	Estate Duty	2839-2841
1720	Oil and Natural Gas Directorate	2841-2843
1721	Indian Civil Service	2843-2845
1722	Oil Wells in Assam	2845-2846
1724	Geological Survey	2846-2847
1727	Foreign Magazines	2848-2849
1730	Indian Council of Scientific and Industrial Research.	2849-2851
1731	Welfare Extension Projects.	2851-2852
1732	Development of Fish Technology	2852-2854
1734	Confidential Reports of Government Officials	2854-2857
1736	Income-tax Appellate Tribunal	2857-2858
1737	Hearing-aids.	2858-2859
1738	Development of Hockey	2859-2861
1739	I. A. F. Maintenance Command	2861-2862
1741	Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur	2863-2864
1743	Lignite Deposits in Mohindergarh District	2864-2866
1723	Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rajasthan	2866-2867
1725	Promotion of Hindi.	2867-2869
1726	Amenities for Civil Areas in Cantonment	2869-2870

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

S.Q.No.	*Subject*	
1728	Central Over Seas Scholarships	2870-2871
1729	Income-tax Evaders.	2871
1733	Union Public Service Commission	2871-2872
1735	Training in Oil Prospecting	2872
1740	Grants for Propagation of Hindi	2872-2873
1742	Propagation of Hindi	2873
U.S.Q.No.		
1436	Education Scheme for Andamans	2873
1437	Tripura Police Force	2873-2874
1438	Jumias Rehabilitation	2874
1439	Scheduled Tribes of Madhya Pradesh	2874
1440	Post Matric Scholarships for Scheduled Castes	2874-2875
1441	Post-Matric Scholarships for Scheduled Tribes	2875
1442	State Bank of India	2875-2876
1443	Education of the Blind	2876
1444	Military Music School, Panchmarhi.	2876
1445	Fire Arms	2877
1446	Permits for Jammu and Kashmir.	2877
1447	Manganese Ore	2877
1448	Urgban Welfare Family Projects.	2877-2878
1449	Geological Survey Department for Punjab and Pepsu	2878
1450	Central Government Employees	2878-2879
1451	Military Dairy Farms	2879-2880
1452	Smuggling.	2880
1453	Engineering College at Patiala	2880-2881

U.S.Q.No.	Subject	Columns
1454	Ordnance Factories	2881-2882
1455	Rifles	2882
1456	Manipur Officer's Pay Scales	2882-2883
1457	Janata Colleges	2883
1458	Educational Films	2883
1459	Development of Backward Areas	2883-2884
1460	Survey of India	2884
1461	Central Secretariat	2885
1462	Research Project Centres	2885-2886
1464	All India Service	2886
1465	Ordnance Factories, Kirkee	2886-2887
1466	Community Organisers and Social Workers	2887-2888
1467	History of Indian Independence	2888
1468	Deportation of Foreigners	2888-2889
1469	Iron Ore Deposits.	2889
1470	Joint Financial Corporation for Delhi and Punjab	2889
1471	Grants for Library Development	2890
1472	State Bank of India.	2890
1473	Re-employment of I.C.S. Officers	2890-2891
1474	International Voluntary Work Camps	2891
1475	Illegal Entry into India	2891-2892
1476	Indian Citizenship	2892
1477	Regional Offices of the Education Ministry	2892-2893
1478	Tripura State Bank Limited	2893
1479	Ordnance Factory, Jubbalore	2893-2894
1480	American Aid	2894
1481	Community Organisers and Social Workers	2894-2895
1482	Central Detective Training School	2895
1483	Canteen Stores Department	2896
1484	International Bank and Monetary Fund	2896
1485	Literatures and Artists	2896-2897
1486	I. A. S. and I. P. S. Trainees	2897
1487	Basic Education Schools	2897
1488	Rajasthan Banks	2898
1498	Acquisition of lands near Babina	2898-2899
1490	Works of Kalidas.	2899
1491	Grants to Madhya Bharat	2899-2900
1492	Employment in Foreign Missions	2900-2901
1493	Assay Department	2901-2902

GIPN—S1—96 Lok Sabha—28-1-57—840.

Wednesday,
25th April, 1956

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIA
NEW DELHI

SIX ANNAS (INLAND) TWO SHILLINGS (FOREIGN)

CONTENTS

[Part II Debates, Volume IV—18th April to 8th May, 1956]

No. 46—*Wednesday, 18th April, 1956.*

	COLUMNS
Motion for adjournment—	
Strike by civilian employees of Naval Dockyards and Depots at Bombay.	5623–26
Papers laid on the Table	5626–27
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Fiftieth Report	5627
Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirty-second Roport	5627–36
Jammu and Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Bill	5636–37
States Reorganisation Bill	5637–40
Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill	5640–50
Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill	5651
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill	5651
Finance Bill—	
Motion to consider	5652–5756
Rules Committee—	
Second Report	5756
Daily Digest	5757–60

No. 47—Friday, 20th April, 1956

Motion for Adjournment—	
Strike by Civilian employees of Naval Dockyard and Depots at Bombay.	5761-65
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill	5765–69
Finance Bill—	
Motion to consider	5769–5832
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions Fiftieth Report	5832–33
Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of Section 429)—	
Motion to consider	5833–60
Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bill (Amedment of Section 77 etc.—	
Motion to consider	5860–78
Daily Digest	5879–80

No. 48—Saturday, 21st April, 1956

	Columns
Petitions *re.* States Reorganisation Bill	5881
Finance Bill—	
Motion to consider	5881–5913
Clauses 2 to 37, Schedules I to IV and clause 1	5914–6033
Motion to pass as amended	6033–35
Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirty-third Report	6035
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill—	
Motion to consider	6036–45
Clauses 1 to 3 and the Schedule	6045–46
Motion to pass as amended	6046
Daily Digest	6047–48

No. 49—Monday, 23rd April, 1956

Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirty-third Report	6049–51
Motion *re.* suspension of first proviso to Rule 92	6051–78
States Reorganisation Bill—	
Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6078–6172
Daily Digest	6173–74

No. 50—Tuesday, 24th April 1956

Arrest of a Member	6175
Paper laid on the Table	6175–76
Motion for Adjournment	
States Reorganisation Bill—	
Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6176–6290
Daily Digest	6291–92

No. 51— Wednesday, 25th April, 1956

Motion for adjournment—	
Arrest of certain demonstrators	6293–96
Business of the House	6297–98
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Fiftys-first Report	6298
Rules Committee—	
Third Report	6222
States Reorganisation Bill—	
Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6298–6322, 6323–6420
Daily Digest	6421–22

No. 52—*Thursday, 26th April,* 1956

	Columns
Estimates Committee— Twenty-Fifth Report	6423
Rules Committee— Third Report	6423–55
States Reorganisation Bill— Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6455–72
Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill— Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6472–6540
Message from Rajya Sabha	6540
Daily Digest	6541–42

No. 53—*Friday, 27th April,* 1956

Papers laid on the Table	6543
Detention of a Member	6543–44
Petition *re.* Hindu Succession Bill	6544
Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill— Motion to refer to Joint Committee	6544–95
Hindu Succession Bill— Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha	6596–6616
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions— Fifty-first Report	6616–17
Resolution *re.* nationalisation of banks	6617–65
Resolution *re.* Ceiling on income of an individual	6665
Message from Rajya Sabha	6666
Half-an-hour discussion *re.* Working Journalists	6666–80
Daily Digest	6681–84

No. 54—*Monday, 30th April,* 1956

Papers laid on the Table	6685
President's Assent to Bill	6685
Message from Rajya Sabha	6686
Travancore-Cochin Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill	6686
Estimates Committee— Twenty-sixth Report	6686
Calling attention to matter of urgent public inportance— Retrenchment in Ordnance Factories	6687–90
Statement on Industrial Policy of Government	6690–99
Business of the House	6699–6702

COLUMNS

Manipur State Hill Peoples (Administration) Regulation (Amendment) Bill 6702–10

Manipur (Village Authorities in Hill Areas) Bill 6711

Hindu Succession Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—

Motion to consider . . 6711–6812, 6813–18

Life Insurance Corporation Bill . 6812

Half-an-hour discussion *re.* Cement . 6818–32

Daily Digest. 6833–36

No. 55—*Tuesday, 1st May,* 1956

Paper laid on the Table 6837

Proceedings of Legislatures (Protection of Publication) Bill . 6837

Hindu Succession Bill—
Motion to consider 6837–6952

Daily Digest 6953–54

No. 56—*Wednesday, 2nd May,* 1956

Election to Committee—
National Food and Agricultural Organisation Liaison Committee . 6955–56

Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill 6956–57

Message from Rajya Sabha 7055

Hindu Succession Bill—.
Motion to consider . . . 6973–7055
6957–73

Clauses 2 to 5 . . . 7055–82

Daily Digest 7083–84

No. 57—*Thursday, 3rd May,* 1956

Papers laid on the Table 7085

Message from Rajya Sabha 7085–86

Business of the House 7086–88

Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill 7089–91

Travancore-Cochin Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill—
Amendment recommended by Rajya Sabha 7091–7100

Hindu Succession Bill—
Clauses 5, 6 and 4 7100–7240

Daily Digest 7241–42

No. 58. *Friday, 4th May,* 1956

	COLUMNS
Business of the House	7243–453, 7355
Hindu Succession Bill as passed by Rajya Sabha—	
Clauses 7 to 10	7245–7338
Factories (Amendment Bill) (*Amendment of Sections* 51, 54 *and* 59)	7339
Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bill (*Amendment of Section* 77 *etc.*)	7339–47
Proceedings of Legislatures (Protection of Publication) Bill—	
Motion to consider as reported by Select Committee	7347–50
Clauses 2 to 4 and 1	7350–55, 7355–78
Motion to pass, as amended	
Mines (Amendment) Bill (*Amendment of sections* 33 *and* 51)—	7378
Motion to consider	7378–84
Daily Digest	7385–86

No. 59. *Monday, 7th May,* 1956

Papers laid on the Table	7387–88
President's Assent to Bill	7388
Messages from Rajya Sabha	7389
Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill	7389
Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirty-fourth Report	7389
Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House—	
Fourteenth Report	7390
Minutes of Estimates Committee (1954-55), Vol. 4, No. 2	7390
Hindu Succession Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—	
Clauses 10 to 25 and Schedule	7390–7528
Daily Digest	7529–32

No. 60. *Tuesday, 8th May,* 1956

Release of a Member	7533
Arrest of Members	7533
Hindu Succession Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—	
Clauses 25 to 33 and 1	7534–7650
Motion to pass as amended	7651–7716
Daily Digest	7717–18

GIPN—SI—415 Lok Sabha—27-3-57—840

Block C
Acc. No. 25566
Dated 30.3.2015

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, 25th April, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Half Past Ten of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(*See Part I*)

11-30 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ARREST OF CERTAIN DEMONSTRATORS

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Sadhan Gupta and Shri Nambiar. The subject is :

> "The flagrant and undemocratic interference with civil liberty in the capital by arrest of peaceful pro-Samyukta Maharashtra demonstrators on the 24th April, 1956".

Does the hon. Home Minister want to say anything on the matter?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I do not see how this motion can be admitted. The police or those in charge of law and order have to make arrests every day, and that is their usual duty. If the persons arrested are found innocent they are let off. But if these arrests by themselves have to give rise to motion for adjournment, then there will be no other business transacted in this House. So far as this particular case is concerned, I regret that a necessity has arisen for arresting some men in the precincts of the Parliament House yesterday. They have come from a long distance in order to offer satyagraha. That was part of their scheme, and their intention was to make a demonstration which would involved their arrests. That was their desire. But I am sorry that such an incident has taken place. We all know that the people of Maharashtra have strong feelings on this subject of Bombay being kept apart from Maharastra. It does not call for any demonstration. The intensity of their feelings is realised. So I do not see that it will serve any purpose. But anyway, that is something beyond my province at present. But I can only hope that such incidents will not recur.

The action was taken under the Punjab Security Act under which demonstrations, processions etc., in and around the precincts of Parliament House and roundabout Delhi are prohibited. In fact, we would not be able to conduct our business if there was no such arrangement. Even when I was coming here, I saw another group shouting slogans about matters connected with the transport business or something like that. They were shouting and making such noise that if they were to come here we would not be able to do any business here. It is in the interests of the House that we all should co-operate in conducting its business in a decent and dignified way. I do not know if any one wants the proceedings of the House to be disturbed. If nobody wants the proceedings to be disturbed, then, all of us should co-operate to see that nothing like this happens in the vicinity of Parliament. Men have their complaints. Occasionally they are not satisfied. Occasionally, they also make demonstrations, but this is not the place where these things should be demonstrated. Again, that is not in any way consistent with the dignity of this House or of our people.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East) : The Home Minister, in opposing the admissibility of the adjournment motion, has said that arrests are taking place every day and if they were made the grounds for an adjournment motion then the business of the House would be impossible. I would draw a distinction between the arrests that took place yesterday from other arrests, say, in the ordinary course of preventing and punishing crimes that take place. No one would think of making an adjournment motion on that ground. Even arrests of this kind, I do admit, are rather

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

too frequent for our liking. But the fact that personal liberty is being violated wantonly and repeatedly does not detract from the urgency of the matter or the public importance of the matter. We are here to uphold personal liberty. That is the urgency.

In this particular case, the demonstrators were peaceful. They were coming to let us know the depth of their feeling. Apparently, in spite of the depth of their feeling, the Government have not been convinced. I think there is nothing wrong in the people by whom we were sent to Parliament, coming to the House in a peaceful manner to let us know what they feel about particular things. The prevention of these demonstrations through the Security Acts is of doubtful legal validity, and apart from its legal validity, the moral justification of it is very seriously in question. I think these things should stop altogether. Therefore, as we have the right guaranteed by the Constitution to assemble peaceably and without arms and to give expression to our opinion and to have free speech, all those Acts, I think, cannot be used as a ground for stopping the demonstrations which are peaceful, which express the people's opinion and which certainly do not cause very much disturbance to our proceedings. After all, we are at a safe distance from every kind of demonstration. I doubt not that it is far from the thought of the demonstrators to impede our proceedings. They only want to let us know their feeling and it is a very just feeling and they want Bombay to go to Samyukta Maharashtra and be its capital. So, I think on these grounds it is very proper that the adjournment motion should be admitted and discussed in the House.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the demonstration is concerned, it is admitted by the hon. Member who has tabled the adjournment motion that the object of the demonstrators was to come and make demonstrations peacefully. 'Peacefully' obviously means that they do not throw stones. All the same, demonstrations and slogans and other things are resorted to, so that our attention might be drawn to them. They want us to note that they want Samyukta Maharashtra and that therefore we must yield and take care to note their points. But I do not know how we can get along with the work here in the face of such things.

There are methods of sending in any grievances that may arise. We are receiving petitions. The hon. Members know that signed petitions can be sent or presented by any hon. Member in relation to any Bill that is pending before the House. They can be sent to the Secretary. These are the methods which have been provided for in the rules and the hon. Members have been taking advantage of those provisions. Those petitions are more than demonstrations. They will be printed or they will be sent to the Petition Committee and circulated to all the hon. Members. But, more than that, if the people should be allowed to enter these precincts and be allowed to make demonstrations and—though peacefully —are allowed to shout "We want Bombay," etc., I do not know how we can go on with our work silently here and attend to the business of the House. Does the hon. Member mean that this is the way in which civil liberty ought to be maintained?

Further, there is already an order passed under the Punjab Security Act that within particular limits of this House demonstrations ought not to be allowed. It is in the interests of proper conduct of the proceedings of the House. Otherwise, it would be impossible to carry on. They have tried to disobey it, and they have come here. Normally, such adjournments motions ought not to be allowed. I would not even bring such motions before the House. This is a matter of law and order. But so far as Delhi is concerned, law and order are in the hands of the Central Government. Yet, even then, whatever normal steps have to be taken cannot be the subject-matter of an adjournment motion. Under these circumstances, such a motion cannot be allowed. Many a day we find so many persons going about the streets and making demonstrations and shouting "We want more wages" etc. But, if they come to the very doors of the Parliament and if they are allowed to make demonstrations, so that the sound may get beyond the walls and reach us and attract our attention, how can we get along with the work? It must be left to the Speaker to take disciplinary action against them and the Government should help us to carry on our proceedings undisturbed.

This motion is rather curious; I refuse to give my consent to it. I hope that in future such adjournment motions will not be made.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the next business. Sardar Hukam Singh to present a report.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Before he does so, I have to point out that I gave notice under Rule 215 of the Rules of Procedure to call the attention of the Defence Minister to a matter which is very serious. Large-scale retrenchment of about 10,000 workers in the ordnance depots of the Defence establishment is going on and I gave notice of my motion on that. I was told by the office that the matter will be discussed today. I got a letter from your office dated 16-4-1956 stating it would be answered today. But I got another letter yesterday marked "Most Immediate" in which it is stated that the statement will not be made by the Defence Minister on the 25th April, 1956. I find the hon. Defence Minister here and I would like to know the reason for this and also the exact position now. I would also request the Minister to state how the retrenchment can be stopped.

The Minister of Defence (Dr. Katju): There is no question of any retrenchment in the month of April. So far as my statement is concerned, I propose to make it either by the end of this week or on Monday positively.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of order, with regard to any matter, Sir. I understand that in contravention your directive ....

Mr. Speaker: Let me dispose of this matter.

Shri Kamath: I took it as having been disposed of.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, it is true that the statement of the hon. Defence Minister was fixed for today. But, the hon. Minister has written the following letter.

> "I wrote to you the other day that I might make a statement on the surplus labour in ordnance factories on the 25th April; but, the matter is still under consideration and I should like to postpone making the statement by another 2 or 3 days. I shall do so by the end of this week or on Monday next."

Therefore, let us wait and see. If a full statement is made. it will enable us to know what the real situation is. Therefore, the hon. Minister will make the statement before the end of this month.

Shri Kamath: On a point of order, Sir. In contravention of the very salutary directive which emanated from you some days ago, I understand that the Select Committee of the House continues to meet when the House is sitting. I drew your attention to this matter a few days ago and you promised to look into it. The Select Committee meeting goes on till 11-30 or even later, and that is why there is at times no quorum in the House even during Question Hour.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member brings it to my notice only just when I am sitting here suddenly. I must know exactly under what particular circumstances the Select Committee meeting is held. I do not have the facts about this particular Select Committee meeting. If the House itself wants that this matter has to be disposed of quickly, they ask my permission to get along with it and I grant permission on this condition. The Speaker shall be constantly watching if there are sufficient number of Members in the House; the moment the number falls below the minimum, it is the duty of the Committee to disperse. Under exceptional circumstances, I thought it necessary to give permission, because the House itself wants the quick disposal of a particular matter. If any particular matter is in contravention of what I have laid down, if the hon. Member only just sends me a word, I can make enquiries as to what exactly the position is.

Shri Kamath: I had drawn your attention to this matter a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker: I shall be looking into this matter from time to time. If it is proper, I will allow it: if it is improper, I will not give my permission.

Shri Kamath: So, there is no directive, or have you modified it?

Mr. Speaker: I give permission under special circumstances.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-FIRST REPORT

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I beg to present the Fifty-first Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the motion for reference of the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee. As the House is aware, the discussion on that motion is scheduled to end today. When shall I call the hon. Minister?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): At whatever time the House decides.

Mr. Speaker: How much time would the hon. Minister like to have?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I would like to know how much time the House can spare.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Minister give us an idea of the time he may require, having regard to the discussion here?

Pandit G. B. Pant: About 40 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: All right; the House is sitting till 5-30; I will call the hon. Minister at 4-50.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I make a request? Let the General discussion go on today. The Minister can reply tomorrow; he will come with a fresh mind.

Mr. Speaker: We have fixed up three days. However, if the hon. Minister finds it more convenient to reply tomorrow, I have no objection.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have no particular objection to it. I do realise that about an hour was taken up by the discussion on the point of order.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): That was what I wanted to point out.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If hon. Members want to have some more time, I am prepared to give it.

Mr. Speaker: The debate will conclude today and the hon. Minister will reply tomorrow.

Before I call upon the hon. Member to continue his speech, I would like to dispose of the point of order that was raised briefly. Mr. More raised a point of order, namely, there are two Bills that have been introduced in this House—the States Reorganisation Bill and the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. He pointed out the use of the expression or the category of Union territories sought to be provided in the States Reorganisation Bill. All the States Parts A, B and C—are called States and the other territories are called Union territories. The hon. Member pointed out that Union territory is a new category to be introduced, for which in the Bill to amend the Constitution, provision is sought to be made by amending Schedule I, and therefore, until the amendment is made, *i.e.*, until the provision is made for the category of Union territories, no such territory can be created under the S.R.C. Bill. Attention was drawn to two previous rulings that I had given on a prior occasion that if one Bill depends on the passing of another Bill, before the latter Bill on which the other Bill depends is passed and it has received the assent of the President, further steps ought not to be taken regarding the first Bill. After those two rulings were given, it was thought necessary to make a provision in the rules themselves and rule No. 85 was framed in similar terms, carrying out the spirit of the rulings.

I have looked into the matter carefully. Regrouping of the existing States, formation of new States, detaching some portion from the existing States or adding to any State or territory are all provided for under Article 3 of the Constitution. The S.R.C. Bill, in so far as it relates to these matters, is based on the power given to the Parliament under Article 3 of the Constitution. Article 1 refers to India being a Union of States, the territory of India comprising the territories declared to be the States and the territories specified in Part D of the First Schedule and other territories which are acquired. According to me, the whole of the territory of India consists of two territories: territories belonging to the States and territories belonging to the Union. These territories are put in Part D, so that reference can be made to their administration in the other sections and provisions of the Constitution. There is nothing like a Part D State. It is Union Territory. Therefore, there is no fresh category that is thought of.

Even apart from that, re-distribution of States can take place under article 3. An area can be included in a State, as Ajmer is included in Rajasthan. That is, under clause (b) of article 3. A new State can be formed by the addition of various States.

Shri Ramamath: Ajmer is a Part C State.

Mr. Speaker: Ajmer a Part C State can be included in a Part A or Part B State. Likewise, in an existing State, some territory can be taken away and that State can be diminished to that extent. The Union Territory Bombay will be a diminution from the existing State. But, all the same, either it will be a Part A State belonging to a State or if it does not belong to a Part A State, it will belong to the Union. To bring it within the jurisdiction of the Union, it must be put into Part D. I agree that it must be put into Part D. For putting it into Part D and calling it by that name, an amendment of the Constitution is sought by a separate Bill. Unless it is put into Part D, the Centre will not have jurisdiction to deal with it. My impression is that the persons who have tabled other amendments of the Constitution independently have ignored the fact that under article 4 of the Constitution, whenever an amendment is made or a new area is created or the original area is diminished, or a new State is created under article 3, provisions by way of amendment of the First Schedule should be made in that Bill itself and no separate Bill is necessary. It is mandatory. It is not as if it is optional. In these circumstances, the First Schedule in the Constitution Amendment Bill must have been brought as a Schedule to the States Reorganisation Bill. In these circumstances, there are no two Bills. Rule 85 will apply only if there are two Bills, one depending on the passing of the other Bill. The Mover of the Bill has introduced two Bills; as a matter of fact, there must be one. This amendment of the Schedule is part and parcel of the States Reorganisation Bill. If there is a lacuna, it must be made up in the Joint Committee or after it is returned from the Joint Committee. It is not a separate Bill. If it becomes part and parcel of the same Bill, the rules or the rulings quoted do not apply. The rulings will apply only if there are two Bills, one depending on the other. This is a case where there ought not to be two Bills. There ought to be one single Bill. There may be an amendment of Schedules I and IV. In these circumstances, merely because they have put in a separate Bill, it does not become a separate Bill. Only, the Schedules will have to be added to this. Clause (b), Union Territories, etc., can be thrown out.

There is no definition of Union territory as the property of Parliament and so on.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): That definition is given in the Constitution Amendment Bill.

Mr. Speaker: True. So far as the amendment of Schedules I and IV of the Constitution, to bring them into line with the amendments, clubbing together of various States, formation of new States, taking away from States, adding to States under article 3, there ought not to be a separate Bill. It must be part and parcel of the Bill itself. If by change they have put in any separate Bill, I am not going to treat it as a separate Bill. There must be an addition to this Bill itself here. If there is a lacuna it must be made up somewhere. There is no authority for treating it as a separate Bill and the other Bill preventing this Bill. Because a reference has been made to that Bill, so far as it relates to amendments under article 3 of the Constitution, it must be followed by a consequential amendment of I and IV in the Bill itself under article 4 of the Constitution. That other Bill to that extent ought not to be treated as a separate Bill. We may ignore that Bill. An amendment must be made to this Bill. I would suggest that instructions may be given to the Joint Committee to add a Scheduled of those items which are Schedules to the Constitution Amendment in so far as they are consequential on the grouping of States and so on. That must be made part and parcel of this Bill itself. That can be done by the Joint Committee. Or, after it comes from the Joint Committee, it can be done. That the framers of this Bill have chosen to put in a separate Bill, does not take away the right of this House to insist upon those amendments being carried out as part and parcel of this original Bill itself. If that is the view, there is no objection to the original Bill going on.

Shri S. S. More: You will please permit me to seek some clarification. Shall I be correct if I understand according to your ruling that necessary amendments in the Constitution under article 4 shall be treated to have been carried out by this Bill and to that extent the necessary part in the Constitution Amendment Bill shall be incorporated in the present Bill? If that ruling is accepted, all the provisions which are laid down in the Constitution and the rules

[Shri S. S. More]

for the passing of Constitution Amendments will have to be applied to this Bill.

Shri A. M. Thomas: (Ernakulam): No, no. Because, under the article itself....

Mr. Speaker: I shall answer.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have to go to the other House at 12 O'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard the hon. Home Minister the other day. I am giving my ruling. If the hon. Member has any doubts I am trying to clarify.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Under article 4, clause (2) ....

Mr. Speaker: I shall say myself.

Shri S. S. More: My submission, Sir, is,—not to have any breach of the rules, I request you to take the Chair; Ministers are also on their legs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member need not point out small things. We are on a serious thing. I shall answer the hon. Member's question.

Shri S. S. More: You will permit me one minute, Sir, I referred by sample to one part. If you take into consideration the States Reorganisation Bill, it encroaches upon so many constitutional provisions. Take for instance,....

Mr. Speaker: I am aware of that. Article 4 says: "Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3...."

It is, under article 3 that new States are constituted, old States are split or some portions thrown out, etc.—

> "shall contain .... amendment of the first Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provision of the law.....

I need not read the rest.

> "(2) No such law as aforesaid shall be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purposes of article 368."

Therefore, the consequential amendment under article 4 modifying the First and Fourth Schedules consequent upon the amendment under article 3 is not an amendment within the four corners of article 368 and no special majority is necessary. I am aware there are certain other amendments which do not arise out of article 3. Those separate amendments of the Constitution will have to stand. In so far as those portions which stand in the way of our proceeding with this Bill may be considered. What was brought to my notice was in regard to the Union territory which comes under articles 3 and 4. My ruling is that there is no objection or impediment to proceeding with this motion for reference to the Joint Committee. I have given the ruling already. If any other things are pointed out, so far as those points are concerned, as and when they arise, I will give my ruling.

Shri S. S. More: Before proceeding further, may I make my submission in continuation of the remarks that I have already addressed to you and to which you were indulgent enough to give attention? In order to economise the time of House, I referred by way of sample to one provision. If we carefully study the States Reorganisation Bill, and the parallel Bill, the Constitution Ninth Amendment Bill, you will find that they run parallel to each other and some provisions are duplicated. As far as article 368 is concerned if it is only territorial alteration, I can understand that the requisite majority will not be necessary. I perfectly accept what you have said. There are also other provisions of the Constitution which are sought to be amended by this particular measure. Unless those provisions become part of the Constitution by accepting the other Bill, any provision to that effect will be *ultra vires* because it is not covered by the existing provisions of the Constitution. If your ruling is extended even to apply to that....

12 NOON.

Mr. Speaker: I am not applying.

Shri S. S. More:....then it will mean that if any provisions of the States Reorganisation Bill conflict with or are not on a par with the provisions of the Constitution, then the provisions of the Bill to that extent will stand suspended.

Mr. Speaker: Let me make it clear. In so far as an amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule arises in consequence of action being taken under article 3 of the Constitution, then to that extent, it will not be a regular amendment of the Constitution. It will

come under article 4. No special majority is necessary, nor need this Bill stand over until the other Bill is agreed to, in so far as that is concerned.

With respect to other matters, I need not give instances, but there are other matters which have not come into this by way of addition, subtraction etc., but independently, such as that the nature of a particular State has been touched and so on. In those matters, unless the Constitution is amended, these other things will not be allowed. As and when particular clauses are taken up, we shall see. I am not going to allow any special majority to be waived, wherever it is necessary. We shall apply our minds as and when each matter comes up.

So far as this matter is concerned, this need not stand over, because this is confined only to article 3.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians) : The difficulty that I envisage as a result of the point raised by my friend Shri S. S. More is this, that all these articles 1, 2, 3 and 4 are governed by what the term 'State' implies. And I think Shri S. S. More suggested that the term 'State' very categorically is seen to mean Part A, Part B and Part C States. That is the meaning attached to the word 'State'. Articles 2 and 3 will not help because either in the formation of States or in the alteration of areas, we are only thinking in terms of States, namely Part A, Part B and Part C States; and any other alterations involving formation of union territories can only come in by an amendment to Part D of the First Schedule; and those are not States.

Mr. Speaker: They are territories.

Shri Frank Anthony: But article 4 will not apply in that case.

Mr. Speaker: It will apply. Article 4 applies not only to States but to territories. The hon. Member has not followed me evidently. He may kindly see clause 3 of article 1 which reads :

> "The territory of India shall comprise—
>
> (a) the territories of the States;
>
> (b) the territories specified in Part D of the First Schedule....".

They are not territories of the States; they are only mentioned in Part D of the First Schedule; they are directly maintained and administered by the Centre. They are union territories. Then clause 3 of article 1 further reads :

"(c) such other territories as may be acquired."

For instance, Chandernagore was acquired by Government before it was made part of Bengal. It was the territory of the Union; and special provision for administration was made. In all those cases, article 4 applies.

Then, with regard to Part A and Part B States a Part B State may be merged in a Part A State. To that extent, article 1 and the First Schedule have to be amended, so that there is a deletion of that particular State. For instance, we may assume that the Mysore State, without being given the name Mysore, is included in a Kannada State. In that case, the First Schedule has to be amended by deleting the word 'Mysore' from the list of Part B States. Similarly, all the Part B States may also go. To that extent, the First Schedule has to be modified. To that extent, there is no difficulty in modification.

But Shri S. S. More referred to cases where an area or a territory is not touched but the manner in which a particular area, as for instance, Delhi, is managed without a Council, without an Assembly, and so on, is such that it must come under a regular constitutional amendment, for which a special majority is necessary.

Shri S. S. More: The point that arises out of your ruling is this.

Mr. Speaker: What are we doing now? So far as this ruling is concerned, this ruling is all right. As and when any other trouble arises, we shall look into the matter again. I am not going to allow a simple majority with respect to the other matters.

Now, who was in possession of the House yesterday?

Shri Gidwani: Already thirty-five minutes have been taken in this.

Shri Kamath: May we know whether any Minister, that is to say, the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister or any other will intervene in the debate today?

Mr. Speaker: Now, Dr. S. N. Sinha.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): I do not know whether you know flying but as I am in temporary possession of the House I would like to pilot everybody straight to Bombay. From the air, what is the panorama you see? It is a panorama different from that of the adjacent Maharashtra. It is a sea-side panorama which is a beautiful and picturesque one. Whether you come from Kerala or Kashmir, Assam or Kathiawad, you will have the same feeling, 'Here is Bombay, here is my home'.

An Hon. Member: 'My home'?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: This is the feeling which you have. In spite of protests, we land at the Chaupati beach, and there we will salute Lok-Manya Tilak and also Vithalbhai, and then mix up with the crowd. And what sort of crowd is it? It is a colourful one where languages are varied and different. There lies the beauty of our country. It lies in the diversity, in the different and picturesque costumes, clothes, languages, and varieties of people. At no cost must this beauty be spoilt. It must be maintained at any cost. And that is the main problem today about Bombay.

The linguistic agitation, which is a very bad thing, has brought dark clouds over Bombay, and therefore, we hear some voice that Bombay belongs only to Maharashtra and to nobody else. Well, that statement is totally wrong. From the very beginning, I must say that. Now, why is it wrong? The Marathi-speaking population is only 43:6 per cent.

An Hon. Member: 48 per cent.

Dr. S. N. Sinha : The rest that is 56·4 per cent. are non-Marathi-speaking people. Therefore, this minority of 43 per cent. has no right to dictate its terms to the rest of the people residing in Bombay.

Shri Kamath: But the others support their claim to Bombay as part of Maharashtra.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I am coming to that. You should not decide that. The Commissions have decided on this problem. First of all, I shall take the Dar Commission. What do they say about the city of Bombay? They say:

> "The city of Bombay stands in special relations to Maharashtra, Gujarat and India as a whole.".

(*Interruptions*). Please do not interrupt. The Dar Commission have made their recommendation on this basis and have said :

> "In all the non-Maharashtrian evidence which came before us, there was practically unanimity that the city of Bombay should be formed into a separate province either Centrally administered, or government of its own, and in no case should be placed under a unilingual government."

Then, the report of another commission is there, namely the JVP report. They have also come to the same conclusion. But that was also not satisfactory to the Maharashtrians. Then, there was the SRC. They also have practically come to the same conclusion. The Maharashtrians said, no, have mercy on us. Their leaders came to our High Command, and they themselves suggested that 'If we return to Maharashtra with this SRC report, then our leadership will be ousted. Please be kind enough. Please be merciful to us, and please change. Even the Swamiji was there. There were also written statements by the President of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee to the All India High Command. They approached them and said 'Please change'. Then, they were asked, 'What is it that will please you? '. They said, 'if you make it Centrally administered, we shall agree to it'. Then, the High Command said, 'All right, if that satisfies you, then let it be so'. It is according to the wishes of the Maharashtrians themselves that in this Bill this provision for Bombay being a union territory has been made. Then, they returned to Maharashtra. They are now coming back and saying, 'Oh! no, we are not satisfied with that; we must have something more'. Then, they approached Panditji. Of course, Panditji is most reasonable even to most unreasonable people. That is why, he said, 'If that does not satisfy you then what can I do for you?' They said, 'Please accept this much, and please say that geographically, Bombay belongs to Maharashtra, and we shall be satisfied.'. As a good man, Panditii went out of his way, and he said, 'If these words only satisfy you, and there will be no further trouble in Bombay, and everything is going to be saved, then all right, I shall say this'. But that also did not satisfy the Maharashtrian people.

Now the Maharashtrians come and say: 'Let us have the right to rule and to trample Bombay'.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Did he say without conviction?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: All right. Shut up.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Dr. Suresh Chandra: The point of order is that the hon. Member has no business to use unparliamentary language. He has no business to say 'shut up' to another hon. Member, who has got such a right of interrpution.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: All right. I will continue with your permission.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: He must withdraw those words.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I will continue because it is no point of order and I am in possession of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am afraid the hon. Member, Dr. Suresh Chandra, invited this upon himself. Why should there be interruption? Why should he interfere? It was then that, the hon. Member said, 'Shut up' do not go on interfering like this. It is but right that he should say so. I should have done it myself; I should have pulled up the hon. Member. Let no hon. Member interfere while another hon. Member is speaking. Each hon. Member has got a right to say what he feels, in so far as it is proper. What he meant was 'keep quiet'. There is nothing wrong.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: Is it parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is unparliamentary. It is a way of saying.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I would like to have your ruling as to whether it is unparliamentary to interrupt any hon. Member. I have never seen anywhere in any other Parliament that interruption is unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: I have been noticing here that interruptions have been going on making it impossible for a Member to go on. This is against all the rules of this House. I have been repeatedly requesting Members not to interfere, not to intervene like this. It is not a casual reference correcting a mistake, but it has got—I do not say it is calculated—all the effect of preventing an hon. Member from replying to some remarks made by other Members and having his say so far as that matter is concerned. I cannot ordinarily condemn this kind of interruption. But it is becoming a normal affair, preventing any hon. Member from exercising his right of addressing the House and convincing this House. This is what is happening. It is very wrong on the part of Members to go on interrupting any hon. Member.

Shri Nambiar: In spite of the fact that he said, 'shut up'?

Mr. Speaker: It is quite ordinary. He only meant, 'keep quiet'. I do not interpret it in any other manner.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I was making a very good point which had been disturbed due to this interruption. That point is that the provisions in this Bill regarding Maharashtra and Bombay have been made according to the wishes of the Maharashtrians themselves. But at every step, they were dissatisfied.

An Hon. Member: No.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: My hon. friend says, 'no'. There is something in writing by the President of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee. Shri Shankarrao Deo, Swami Ramananda Tirtha and others come in the month of December and January, approached the High Command and said: "If Maharashtra can have just only this much satisfaction, and in the Bill it is provided, that Bombay will be Centrally administered, we will be satisfied". After that, on the 16th January, the announcement was made. Before that, all the discussions took place. So it was according to their wish that it was done. And Shri Jawaharlal Nehru went out of his way even to accommodate them and to tell them that Bombay belongs to Maharashtra geographically. He said this out of his way and just to see that nothing untoward happened in Bombay and no disturbances took place, and that everything would go smoothly in the country—as it is necessary at the present moment

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

But it is not a gentleman's behaviour if, once a demand is acceded to, somebody goes on, once, twice, three times and four times raising and raising his demands higher up. That is Hitler's tactics, and that is dictatorial. That will break the country into pieces. That is why this provision which has been put in the Bill that Bombay should be Union territory, is according to the wish of the Maharashtrians themselves. They should have accepted it very gracefully. But now they are going further and further. So it is high time that the rest of India on behalf of the rest of the population of Bombay told them: 'Now please stop. Thus far and no further, for the present'. May be—as everything changes —as Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has said, if in the future context things change, Bombay may belong to Maharashtra. Nobody is against it. But in this respect, there is some misinterpretation made on the floor of the House.

I am very glad that yesterday Shri Gadgil was very temperate and very considerate. That has cooled down the atmosphere. But I remember one thing. Last time, when he spoke on the SRC Report, he did not do justice to his friend of 40 years' standing, Shri Morarji Desai. He quoted Shri Morarji Desai as saying (in Marathi) :

"कांग्रेस जीवन्त असेपर्यंत मुंबई महाराष्ट्रास मिलणार नाही"

Rendering it in English, he said :

> "It means, so long as Congress is alive, Maharashtrians will not get Bombay".

I was surprised at what he said, because a responsible person like Shri Morarji Desai should never have said such a thing. Therefore, I found out again, and here it is. Here is what Shri Morarji Desai said during the discussion of the States Reorganisation Bill in the Bombay Assembly:

> "I am very sorry that I am being misquoted even in this matter.. . . I only said this, that violence will never get Bombay for Maharashtra and it should not get.... If democracy is to survive in this country, nothing should be given, if there is any violence, whatever may be the case; otherwise, democracy will not survive."

That is what he said, and I think any reasonable man, whether in this House or outside this House, in fact. the whole country, will agree. Suppose you succumb to violence or to threats. What will happen to the country? If you break something in Bombay, it is not only a question of Bombay; the whole of India will go to pieces.

Therefore, although Shri Gadgil was very mild yesterday, there were a few things in his speech which, of course, must be made very clear. He said that Maharashtra has its 'vested interest' in Bombay and that should be accepted by this House, and by the rest of India. There is some venom in these words 'vested interest'. It is a vicious thing and should never be accepted by India, because it is sweetened poison, if you put it mildly. Thc other part of India has no right to swallow it. Yet, in spite of that, I appreciate what Shri Gadgil said yesterday.

I will draw the attention of the House to one thing more. These linguistic riots and strikes have done much more harm to the cause of Maharashtra itself than to anybody else. It may be that later on things will change, but any further emphasis on these things is wrong. Coercion of the whole of India is wrong and it is damaging the cause of Maharashtra. The way the case of Maharashtra is being put is against the interests of India; it clashes and conflicts with the interests of the rest of India. In response to Shri Gadgil's pleading, may I very respectfully plead with him that the measures proposed in this Bill for the City of Bombay becoming a Union territory—and this is the decision of the Maharashtrians—should be accepted.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Since my time is up, I cannot leave you in Bombay just to linger around the shores of Juhu, I will take you back to Delhi, and perhaps, if you find that it is too hot, in a couple of minutes, I will take you to Simla which is a cool place—because I always rush there when it is hot.

In Simla, you will find that there is another problem. The portion from Simla to Kalka must be given to Himachal Pradesh. If there is any justification for the claim of anyone to any territory, it is the claim of Himachal Pradesh to the territory from Simla to Kalka including the city of Simla.

Now, having cooled down I will also say one word about Vindhya Pradesh. The Baghelkand area of that State should go to the U.P.

In conclusion, I will only say this: that the Home Minister deserves warm —rather very hot—congratulations for bringing this Bill before the House. The provisions of the Bill are acceptable to the largest number of our people. Therefore, we give it all round support. I am convinced that the political wisdom and the determined strength of the Indian people under the wise leadership of Panditji and Shri Govind Ballabh Pant can, must and will, carve out a happy and bright future for the whole country, not only for Bombay or Simla, but for the whole of India.

Shri V. V. Giri (Pathapatnam): Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may come to the front.

Shri V. V. Giri: I will be audible from here; I shall speak from the back benches; there is no question about it.

After the marathon debate that we had a few months ago, I do not think much time need be spent in commending this Bill for the consideration of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament. The very illuminating speeches and statements made inside the House and outside by our leader, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and the illuminating speeches made also by the Members of this House, have been of great educative value to the masses of the country, whether in towns or in villages and today everyone understands the implications of the issues involved. There is no denying the fact that today everyone realises that emphasis in India should be put not on sectarianism or narrow provincialism but that everyone should feel that he is an Indian first, Indian last and an Indian always and that would be to the benefit of this country.

I am, therefore, glad that the hon. Home Minister has introduced in this Bill a provision for Zonal Councils. But, I would respectfully submit to him that unless we go a step further—it may be good as far as it goes—but, unless we go a step further and make it clear that these Zonal Councils, after 5 years, will be replaced by Zonal States, North, South, East, West and Central, my fear is that the Zonal Councils will merely be on paper and will not be able to produce results that are expected.

I would like to place before this House that if we believe in the unity of this country, which should be the ultimate destiny, the problem of the minorities that will be in the border areas must be solved beyond the possibility of a doubt and, in the course of 5 years, it should be not only made the ideal but the objective of the State Governments and the majority population in each State, to assure the minorities that they are as safe as before, if not safer, in the newly formed States. Therefore, I consider that this matter should be given top priority and if this matter is given top priority and the minorities are made to be convinced that in whichever part of India they may stay they will be quite happy, then the unity of India shall be attained. We shall not talk parochialism or sectarianism or of linguistic States. This is a matter that ought to attract the attention of the hon. Home Minister.

It may be said, and we all have pious wishes on our parts, that the States will look into these matters, that the Governor will be the custodian of the rights and privileges of minorities; but, I fear, we will not be able to advance. After all, it must be remembered that the Governors are constitutional heads of States and they must tow the line with the Chief Ministers and the Cabinets. Otherwise, the Governors will not have any position in those States. Therefore, I humbly and respectfully place before the hon. Home Minister that the time has come when we have to make it clear that a Central Commissioner, on behalf of the Home Ministry, will be appointed to discharge in those areas—not to create disturbances, not to create trouble but—to make representations, whenever there are issues between States and the minorities, to the Home Ministry who, in consultation with the State Governments will be able to put matters right so that the minorities will forget that they are in a place where they are at a disadvantage. This is a matter which I would like the hon. Home Minister to consider carefully and if this trouble is removed, the unity of India will be assured and every Indian will feel, no matter in which ever part of India he may be, that his rights and privileges, professional, economic, racial and cultural are preserved.

[Shri V. V. Giri]

Therefore, I would like these two points to be made clear either through the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill or in some other form. But, it must be made clear that ultimately, in India, at the close of the next five years, there will be 5 Zonal States. I sometimes feel very unhappy when people in this House, very responsible Members of this House and leaders of the country, feel very much agitated, almost grieved, and they bemoan and feel really submerged and suppressed whenever they think that their State is not preserved, that some part has not come in or some part has not got out. My feeling is,—if I may with all respect state that,—that instead of the S. R. Bill being discussed, if we are straight for the unity of India—no doubt it may be premature as I said in my speech in the last discussion on the S.R.C. Report—if we say straightway that India is a unitary State, that everybody in India, whether he is in Bombay, in Madras, in Calcutta, in Delhi or any other place, can claim every inch of India as his, then all prejudices of parochialism and sectionalism will be drowned and merged with the idea of a unitary State. But, I am not so sure whether all this could be done immediately and here and now.

I must congratulate incidentally Shri Gadgil—for the statesmanlike speech that he has made, and say that none could be happier than me if matters are settled in a proper way during the transitional period. If India has to keep up her place which she has achieved, thanks to the leadership of our Prime Minister —our foreign policy is acclaimed throughout the world as one of the very best and we have achieved today a definite place in the international world—if we have to keep up the place the only hope is from the Zonal Councils to the Zonal States, from the Zonal States to a Unitary State. And, that is the only process through which we have to pass. Let me, as a prophet, say that this is not only possible, not only practicable but it is inevitable. I, therefore, desire that we in this House and elsewhere should make these points quite clear to the people of this country that whatever adjustments are made, whether as regards boundaries or whether as regards minorities, the fact must remain and be placed high before the minds of the people that from the Zonal Councils, in 5 years, we march on to Zonal States and in another 5 years, God Willing, to a Unitary State. I want everyone of you to understand that this is the only possible way of bringing peace and plenty to this country, a Unitary State based on the highest principles of socialist democracy, where everyone is guaranteed his fundamental rights, the right to work, the right to live and all other rights which will make life bearable from the womb to the grave.

Therefore, if all of us desire for our country a real place in the history of the world for ever, if only we can improve our national character, our national dignity and national discipline, all these will be possible. I do hope that everyone of us will try to achieve the goal that I have put forward so that India may have the greatest place in the world.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): At long last, on this important subject, I am given an opportunity to speak. This view, coming from a back-bencher, is more representative because we are more in touch with the common man.

We are not obsessed by our past positions, nor are we obsessed by our future aspirations becoming possible or impossible. The whole question has been approached by the people in a parochial manner only to keep up the enthusiasm of the linguistic fanatics of their area for them to be the leaders, the dictators and the *chhota* Hitlers and Stalins of those areas.

When this Report was being discussed in this House, many harsh words were said which created chaos in the whole country. I would refer the House to two points in the Report.

> "The first essential objective of any scheme of reorganisation must be the unity and security of India. Any movement which may tend to impair unity of the country must ultimately affect the welfare of all sections of the Indian people. Any measure of reorganisation which is likely to create tensions and disharmony must weaken the sense of unity among the people of India and should therefore be discountenanced."

In Chapter IV it is stated :

> "It has been most distressing to us to witness, during the course of our enquiry, a kind of border warfare in certain areas in which old comrades-in-arms in the battle for freedom have been pitted against one another in acrimonius controversy, showing little appreciation of

the fact that the States are but the limbs of same body politic and that territorial readjustments between them should not assume the form of disputes between alien powers."

I want the House to remember these remarks. They observe that it is a passing phase. It may be a passing phase. If it were a passing phase I dont't mind, but it is not so. Long before the Report was written when people gave evidence, the Commission came to this conclusion and since then many months have passed. Has it showed any symbol or symptom of its being a passing phase? Certainly not. We have seen many developments. They say that the Congress has given the slogan of linguistic States. I say that a weapon of war cannot be an instrument of peace. Division of this country on linguistic lines cannot forge unity. If this is possible, then war alone can create peace. It is so fallacious as to say that war is for peace.

If you analyse the people who shout "my State, my language, my country", you will find they are mostly ex-Ministers and some of them who have lost their positions. Some people were aspiring for places and could not get them and have gone astray. Some Government servants who could not compete with others think that if new States are created, the other officers will go and they can become Secretaries, etc. The unemployed man thinks that he will get more opportunities to get employed if the new linguistic States come into being. I hear Shri Vallatharas saying the other day that the Malayalees are dominating all the offices and where could we, the Tamilians go. This is the mentality which is behind the people who shout linguism and then say that there should be unity in India. Let them be more honest and say that they want a sovereign State here and now. Let them be more honest and say that they want to be Chief Ministers of their small States. But they say that they are for the unity of India; and Yet they cannot live together. Russians and Indians are brothers; Chinese and Indians are brothers; but Malayalees and Tamilians are enemies; Maharashtrians and Gujaratis are enemies. What is the picture that we have now? This approach has been a wrong approach by our people.

The philosophy of our politics is truth and non-violence, dilated, it means faith and fearlessness and right means to right ends. What fear has possessed our leaders now I do not know. They say that the people want linguistic division of the country. Did the people go to Mahatma Gandhi and say that they wanted him to lead them? Mahatma Gandhi went to the people; he enthused the people. Here we find that the leaders say that the people want them to do this and so they are giving this reorganisation. People never wanted anything. They want food to eat and house to live in. That is more important.

The language of the pandits is not the language of the masses. These pandits, who shout about linguism, do not understand the language of the masses, and the masses do not understand the literary flourishes of the pandits. That is the real fact about linguistic approach to this question.

Unfortunately, somehow or other, at a time when there were the great riots in Bezwada, Andhra State was created. It was decided in 1949, but it was granted just after Potti Sriramulu's death. The impression created in the whole country was that anything could be achieved through violence. The Travancore-Cochin State troubles in the Pattam Thanu Pillai regime were the outcome of the grant of Andhra State at that particular hour. I was there at that time and I heard them say that 'if Andhras can get it, why not we?' That is being repeated in Bombay.

Let us not repeat that mistake, and call the people to come to a compromise and say that we will give you this and you should be good boys. That compromising attitude has done great harm to us. We should have been definite on certain issues and should be firm when we come to a decision.

Regarding Bombay, much has been talked about the feelings of the people as being very real. When I talked to my friends on either side, this is what they say. The Maharashtrian friends say that they—the Gujaratis—have no confidence in us. First the S.R.C. Report stated that Vidarbha should be separate and bilingual Bombay State should be created, why Vidarbha should be separated—otherwise the Maharashtrian element will be in a preponderant majority. They themselves wanted a separate State, but that is another matter. The Gujarati friends say that they are in a large number—the Maharashtrians—and so they cannot remain with them. Should

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

Gujaratis, whose province gave us Mahatma Gandhi, exhibit feelings of fear that because numerically the Maharashtrians are in larger numbers, the Gujaratis cannot live together with them in one State? Is it reasonable? On the other hand, the Maharashtrians say that 'the Gujaratis do not respect us, do not believe us and wound our feelings'. Both parties have wounded each other's feeling profusely.

Much was said about Maharashtrian leadership. I would appeal, through a humble back-bencher, yet a good Congressman, that in the name of the unity of India the Maharashtrians should think of Mahatma Gandhi, not Morarji Desai. Similarly, I would appeal to my Gujarati friends that they should think not of Gadgil * * * but of Gokhale and Tilak. Gopal Krishna Gokhale was the political guru of Mahatma Gandhi. Should good sentiments, on which they have brought us up, be spoilt for small things like this? Should we exhibit heat on small things?

*** *** ***

My submission in a humble way is—though my friends say it is an era of personality cult—that the personality cult is gone. We suffer from, not personality cult, but want of personality cult. After all, what is this personality cult? Leaders are there. Their wishes, if they are good, should get the endorsement of the people. Our leaders' wish is to have big multi-lingual states and forge the unity of India. But these deputy leaders drag in different directions for some purpose. They, in turn, do not say that they want this. The people are agitated and incited by these very persons We are suffering, at the moment, from the petty personality cult. In this country, where a young man can organise hartals and demonstrations he is respected as a great man. They want to leave the final say to him in all these important matters. If that is going to be the method of reorganisation of our country, I am afraid, that we will be doing a great disservice to our country, whether we like it or not. If India is to be divided on this basis into linguistic States and these States are given a permanent stature, then the ultimate result will be this. Each unit will be economically poor, and politically too, a smaller State is likely to have a weaker voice. It will be taken advantage of by somebody or the other and then what will be the result? The result will be; tension between the Centre and the States and ultimate disintegration.

Yesterday, Shri Gurupadaswamy observed that by setting up Zonal Councils they will become Zonal States and ultimately will become free units. I would like to know the intention. Does the Government of India want small States to be created so that they may be neglected or suppressed and they may not have the power to kick back? We want to be equal partners in the Union, well-respected and well-regarded and each having its opportunity to speak, and act with equal power. If that is the objective, then bigger States would be essential for economic prosperity. If these small States were created on linguistic basis, then difficulties will arise because of the natural resources not being made available to the region. The respective States will be quarrelling. Even if the Centre is willing to do something, it could not do much because the States will not come together.

For instance, take the Bellary question. One party said: "The headworks are there; therefore, we want that area." The other party said: "Our people are there—linguistically-speaking and so we want that." The demands were like that. That means, if such areas like in another State, the people cannot utilise such resources.

Let us apply that theory to the southern States. They are very small. The resources fall in one area and the area where these resources could be utilised falls in another State. Naturally, there will not be co-operation or co-ordination. We cannot organise these things on a co-existence basis. It should be on a co-operative basis or co-parcenary basis. Therefore, for the better economic development of the country, it is absolutely essential that the States must be reorganised on a zonal basis, taking into account the economic viability and the natural resources that are available, and not language alone. I would like to point out as to where these will ultimately lead to.

Shri Nambiar: Does he approve of Dakshina Pradesh?

***Expunged as ordered by this Chair.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Yes. I will say what Pradesh I want. My friends are already disturbed. People who cannot think of a big State, who belong to a party which wants to live on poverty and exploit poverty by creating small States. It is their theory. Why should they be disturbed? I say that on a regional basis, for economic development, we must have a big State. He immediaely jumps and asks: what about Dakshina Pradesh? (*Interruptions.*) I would appeal to the Congress friends on this side. Let us beware. If anything is necessary to create a big State, the only thing necessary is to avoid Aikya Kerala. It is the Communist Party which wants to uphold poverty and create small States in Kerala, Bengal and anywhere else. I challenge them, if they are a living party, if they have faith, and if they have confidence in their theory, let them opt out for a bigger State and fight us in that pattern of organisation. We welcome it. They are not capable of that. They have no originality; it is all sold to somebody else. Take even this personality cult. What did Stalin do? He created the world communist front but he has been let down. Why? The present masters of Russia have dropped him and so he has been let down. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Thanu Pillai: One more point and I would finish.

If, ultimately, linguistic division is to be granted, and accepted, why should there be discord? So much was said about Devikulam and Peermede and also about Gudalur. I would like to see a leader who would say: "Mine is mine and yours is yours." All leaders say: "Mine is mine and yours is mine." Madras wants Devikulam and Peermede because they are predominantly Tamil.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up.

Shri Thanu Pillai: In Gudalur the Malayalees are in a majority but Madras wants it because the Kunda project is there and generation of electricity and natural resources and all these things come in. Kerala wants the Malabar district because Malayalees are in a majority but they do not want to give up the southern taluks which are predominantly Tamil because they want the paddy fields. I can appreciate somebody saying: "I want mine; you better take yours." None of these leaders have said that. Why? They are afraid of saying that they do not want an area and that they are prepared to give it, because the opposition will go and say "See here, these Ministers have not been acquiring this territory." We cannot go on, for this reason, fighting like aliens. Ultimately, the languages of the States are going to be the regional languages. It will be the langauge of the university also. What will be left for the unity of India? Indian unity at best, at the moment, is negative unity, born out of the anti-British front. There will not be any unity if this language and linguistic fanaticism is allowed free play at all levels. Ultimately it might so happen that one Indian will have to talk to another Indian with an interpreter.

One more point and I would have done. The Travancore-Cochin State's temple funds and temple properties have been taken over by the Government and they are given Rs. 51 lakhs every year to meet the temple expenses. Out of this sum, the southern taluks which come to Madras are to get about Rs. 15-20 lakhs but in the Bill the money given is only Rs. 4.5 lakhs. It is not a question of who bears in but what the quantum is. What we are anxious about is that the temples must not be left in the lurch in this reorganisation. After all, they are our national monuments and they are the seats of our cultures. They should not be allowed to be spoiled. The temples at Cape Comorin and Suchindram are so important to us. If these funds are not properly divided and granted, the Madras Government may not find funds from other temples for these temples and these temples with a rich heritage will suffer for want of funds. In spite of your secularism, whether you like it or not, I would submit that—with all respect to all religions in India—from Badrinath to Cape Comorin, the Hindu religion has been giving a spirit of unity, which nothing else has been able to give. No 'ism' has been able to give it. So, the temples which are coming to us should come with full possession of the resources for the maintenance of these temples. I refer to the Devaswom fund. The details may be worked out. My request to the Joint Committee is that Rs. 20 lakhs or whatever amount is required to administer these temples should be given.

RULES COMMITTEE

THIRD REPORT.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Third Report of the Rules Committee.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL.—*contd.*

Sardar Hukam Singh: (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who had been advocating the reorganisation of States on linguistic and cultural basis. I honestly believed that it was in the interest of the country and the people would be able to march faster, and development would come easier if that were done. Now that the reorganisation has been finalised and we have this Bill before us, I welcome this Bill in that respect.

Last time, when I had the occasion to speak on this subject, I had made a reference to the fact that there were two exceptions made, otherwise practically, whatever may be the principles laid down in the reference to the States Reorganisation Commission or by the authors of the Report, the fact remains that the country has been divided on linguistic basis. I said last time that there were two exceptions. One was the Bombay city and the other was the Punjab State.

Now I find that the public opinion is so strong in favour of including Bombay in Maharashtra that I hope that today or tomorrow it would be included in Maharashtra.

Then the only State left is Punjab. I am happy to see that a scheme has been evolved for Punjab as well and that is the Regional Scheme, which every hon. Member must have noticed in the newspapers and other publications. That scheme only creates Regional Committees and gives them power to tender opinions to the legislative assemblies in certain limited spheres. But the overall control is left with the legislative assembly and the Cabinet. I take this opportunity of thanking all the three members of the sub-committee of the Cabinet, who took so much pain in evolving this formula. I congratulate them on their having been able to give something to the Punjabis, which satisfies a large section of the public. I must thank them on behalf of my own community and my party, because they gave us a most patient hearing and tried earnestly to settle the question that was so vexed and complex.

We had certain complaints and now we have accepted this proposal for Regional Committees in the larger interest of the country. But, that has been misunderstood in some quarters. We thought that there was a cry of *jehad* across our borders and the conditions were not such in the country that we should carry on any agitation further. This impelled us to accept much less than our original demand.

As I said, we are the only exception left. Perhaps, I had forgotten much about our original demand, but yesterday, some hon. Members referred to it. More than one hon. Member had occasion to point out that Punjab was the only exception. That revived all those past memories in my mind and, probably, caused me a little pain as well. But I must assure you, Sir, that we are not sorry for having accepted this proposal. As the days pass, we feel confirmed in our convictions, that we have done the right thing and that is what the demands of the country's interest require at the present moment. What is unfortunate is that, that has not been appreciated. Some say that we have been made fools; others say that we were not honest in our intentions, but nobody says that we have done a good thing and the interests of the country require that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I take exception to it.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava assures me that he feels like that. I am thankful to him. At least there are some who feel like that. If Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava says that, he is not the only one; there must be some others also who follow him, because he cannot be without followers.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): Many others.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Who? *Delhiwalas*. I am talking of Punjabis. *Delhiwalas* must be there and I have full sympathy with them also.

Sir, it is unfortunate that some sections are still raising their voice and carrying on a certain amount of agitation. Sometimes it struck me that I should convey to this Government that, if they want to stop this agitation, there is an easy solution to it. If we convey it to the Government just now that we do not accept it, at least the other party will sit down and they will say that they are satisfied. That is the position that has come in the Punjab. It is a very unfortunate position. There is a story told, that some Muslims went to a Mulla to find out what they should do in a certain circumstance. He enquired of them

what the Hindus did. They told him what the Hindus had done, and then he said: "You should do just the reverse". There are certain people who want to keep the Punjab Government engaged for some time in some battle or the other. If the Akalis were fighting, they said that the game was being played, it was all right. They were jubilant and they sat silent. When the Akalis became silent, they have taken upon themselves the task of fighting. They say that they must fight and the battle must go on.

It is not good for the country, nor for any of our people or sections. If really there is some apprehension, I request all those friends to come and sit by me so that we can resolve those differences and remove those apprehensions. If somebody were to ask whether this procedure was offered to them when we had our grievances, I say: "Yes. We requested them to come and sit down by us to remove our fears". We collected at Shri N. C. Chatterjee's house. It is painful to tell you, Sir, the answer that we got. We were told that we were now on the right lines and they will judge us after two or three years, whether we were certainly honest in our intentions. My question to them was, whether we were to be kept on probation for a certain number of years, and the answer came: "Yes".

The scheme does not give us any political supremacy. The regional formula that is evolved gives only security in certain limited subjects. We have been complaining that we have not been justly treated during the last eight or ten years. This gives us an opportunity to tender our advice as well. Even then, when the Cabinet defers from the decision of the Regional Council, there is the Governor to resolve those differences and we will not have our own ways.

Some people had thought that Punjabi Suba would not be given. Of course, it was unfortunate that we had differences among ourselves. It was a peculiar problem. The Punjabis were fighting among themselves. That was not the problem anywhere-else. We were divided among ourselves. And that section, which is now opposing, was of the opinion that Punjabi Suba would not be given. They had hoped that there would be trouble, that the Akalis will launch some agitation and that the Government will take repressive action. They had managed even this much, that they had gone to different parts of the country like Bombay U. P., Madhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and other places and propagated this idea that when the Akalis begin agitation, the Sikhs from those parts of India should be driven out by force. They were banking upon such contingencies and such happenings. But when we thought that it is good in the interest of the country and in our interest as well, we decided that we should try to work this scheme. Worked in proper spirit and given the goodwill, we hope that it might remove the fears that we have. We thought we should work it out honestly and I on behalf of my community and my party assure this House and the country that we wish to work it honestly and sincerely and we will work it. What we want is that it should be worked with the goodwill and cooperation of our brethren as well and that is what I wish to voice on this occasion. Silence on our part in the initial stages was taken as our non-acceptance, because they thought that we would not accept this much only. Our acceptance of it came as a surprise to them. They were not prepared for it. Therefore, they have not been able to reconcile themselves to this position. Sometimes they say that there is some underhand dealing that is not disclosed. What underhand dealing could there be in this matter? The decision arrived at may not be liked by some, but what about others who say that there is something underhand and secret in this? They are basing their case on the presumption that there is something which they do not know and nobody says that there is anything. Is it fair and proper for any section of the people to create fear and suspicion among people and then to carry on their agitation, which is going on at present?

1 P.M.

Therefore, I appeal to all my friends. When I give this assurance I should be believed that we are honest, that we want to work it. Even now there are apprehensions that we are anti-national. Some say that the foundations of Sikh raj have been laid. I do remember, and I should remind Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava because he knows it, when a constituency was not formed according to the wishes of a particular member, there were bold headlines in the papers, language papers, that the foundations of Sikh raj had been laid in Punjab. It was said that Punjab would now go out to Pakistan and we had lost it. Because one constituency was not formed as one particular member wanted it to be. This is a position of which we complain.

[Sardar Hukum Singh]

Now again it is being said that the foundations of Sikh raj have been laid by this regional scheme. I do not know how we can bring round those friends and how to convince them that there is no substance in their fear. We on our part are prepared to sit with them and thrash out any differences in order to try to understand each other. I make an appeal to all those friends and brethren of mine.

What actually has happened is this. I will be excused if what I say it not pleasant to some people. There is a psychology among the people in the Punjab, because of the fact that one community is 70 per cent. and the other is 30 per cent. That psychology has created an inferiority complex and a superiority complex. Of course, if Punjab has got to be divided into two communities, is it a fact that one community would be 70 per cent. and the other would be 30 per cent. This psychology has created the trouble. Now, if the 70 per cent. had continued to enjoy the fruits and privileges of that majority, perhaps there would not have been much complaint. But there was a small section, the urban section—and Chaudhuri Ranbir Singh would agree with me, if not Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava—which was exploiting first the Sikhs and later their own men. They would create terror among the Sikhs by saying you are only 30 per cent. while we are 70 per cent. How will you succeed? Among their own brethren they would say; the Sikhs are anti-national; they want to separate from India; they have a plot with Pakistan; they are consipring to harm India. Then those innocent brethern of their would cling to their chest. They would feel that these persons of Jullundur Division, urbanites, they are their protectors from the aggressive Sikhs who have evil intentions against the country. When they have got their support, they would deny justice to the Sikhs. When that had been done, they would not be fair to their brethern, whom they had terrified. So, both were crying,—the Hariana people as well as the Sikhs. Now, the Sikhs perhaps—I am not complaining—may not be as secure as they wanted to be, but at least Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has become stronger and more secure, because he has got everything that he wanted.

In the course of the debate on the S. R. C. Report our revered friend, Acharya Kripalani mentioned that he had heard of a peculiar species of human beings called Hariana breed, of which he had never heard or read before, though he had heard of Hariana bulls. How could there be bulls without human beings? Now the 55 lakhs of Hariana people have all their fears removed. They are jubilant. They find that they would not be the sufferers now. Now what my brethren in the Jullundur Division find is that they would not be able to utilise these 55 lakhs in order to make up that 70 per cent. majority. That is their only trouble. And that is the reason for the fear. We the Sikhs are happy because we feel that now they would treat us as their brethren. We never wanted any political supremacy, and we have not got it. We are satisfied because we hope that we will be treated as equal brethren. This is all that we wanted and we feel much would depend upon how it is worked and how it is implemented. But we feel for the present that worked in proper spirit that would give us the requisite security and we will be treated as equal partners in a common venture. Therefore, we are happy about it and as I said we congratulate our leaders that they have been able to evolve this formula which we have accepted.

Now, Sir, I want to say something about this Bill as well. If I were to take the state of Punjab, then I feel that there is some nervousness in PEPSU. The provisions that are contained here are framed in such a manner that PEPSU people feel that the whole arrangement is conceived in a spirit—if I may say so—that PEPSU has been conquered by Punjab—one State is the conquerer and the other is the conquered. That feeling ought to be removed. They have in mind clause 14. There is no flaw in the clause as it stands, though there are certain deficiencies in other clauses. Clause 14 lays down that a State can alter or modify areas in a district within their State. The Punjab State by mistake perhaps began to alter the boundaries and there was something given in the Press that they proposed to alter Ferozepore in this way and Jullundur and Kapurthala in another manner. Now, the PEPSU people became nervous and they thought that they had no voice altogether in that respect. They doubted whether it should be done by Punjab alone and before PEPSU has been integrated. The Bill lays down, and rightly so, that the new State would comprise of the territories contained in these two States. If the reorganisation

of the districts is to be effected, that should be done after those territories have joined together, with the common will of both the parties or both people and not with the will of one State alone.

I next refer to clause 29. It says that the Speakers and the Deputy-Speakers will be deemed to have been chosen as Speakers and the Deputy-Speakers of the corresponding new States. That does mean that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker of Punjab would be the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker of the new enlarged State of Punjab. It is correct to say that PEPSU is a part B State. But there should be a provision saying that they should sit together and they might, at their first meeting, elect their new Speaker and the new Deputy-Speaker. Let them elect their own men, but at least the people from PEPSU should feel that they have been associated in that election and that they had a share or a voice when the election was made. This provision which I suggest ought to be considered by the Joint Committee. If only the Punjab State is considered in this matter, the rules of the Punjab State should be applied.

Then, I come to clause 45. As I have said before, PEPSU is a Part B State no doubt. That may be an inferior status. The High Court of Punjab will be the High Court of the new State. What would happen to the judges of the PEPSU High Court? The PEPSU High Court is abolished. What is to happen to the judges there? Nothing has been provided in the Bill in regard to this matter. Even a provision saying that those who come up to the status and position of a High Court judge will be taken in and integrated in the new High Court has not been made in the Bill. Something to that effect should be done and that would give some satisfaction that at least there is a provision for taking them in. I have not been able to find any provision like that though there is one provision so far as the Public Service Commission is concerned. But there is none so far as the High Court is concerned. Further, the Patiala High Court shall cease to exist. These things and certain other things too have created an impression in the minds of smaller States, whose areas are being merged with the others, that there is some superiority being exercised by the bigger States, that is why there is a persistent demand that Patiala should be made the capital. The people of PEPSU feel that in trade, commerce and all other respects, perhaps they will have an inferior status. I have talked not only to the lawyers but the businessmen, traders and others. There is unity, so far as the PEPSU people are concerned, in this matter. Everybody says that the people there are being lowered to some inferior status, and in this feeling, there is no question of any caste, creed, community or profession.

I shall now refer to clause 40 of the Bill. It deals with the constitution of the Delimitation Commission. I thought there would be some change so far as the constitution of this Commission is concerned. I have every respect certainly for the retired judges, be they of the Supreme Court or the High Courts. But my experience shows that these retired judges do not show that much of independence as we expect from them. This is bringing about some deterioration even in respect of those judges who are on the eve of retirement. They begin to look to some patronage from the Government so that as soon as they retire they might be put on some Commission or Tribunal and other bodies. Then, consciously or unconsciously, there is a feeling among the public that these judges are not as independent as we expect our judiciary to be.

I have personal experience, particularly, in this Delimitation Commission. I was also an associate member of that Commission last time. I found that those retired judges only tow the line of the executive. Therefore, these bodies should not be made so much of a fascination for these retired judges. Care should be taken to see that persons of unquestioned independence and integrity are brought in for these Commissions.

Then there is a provision that the Central Government shall nominate five associate members. Objection was taken by one of the hon. Members yesterday and I add my voice to it. The old procedure which was followed last time should not be departed from. The Speaker had done it last time and if the number is to be reduced it should be done by him and not by the Central Government. That is very necessary. Otherwise, perhaps there might be a feeling that justice is not being done to all those parties.

I conclude by saying, as I have said in the beginning, that I welcome this Bill. I wanted a reorganisation though I have not wanted it for my own State. It is for the rest of India that I wanted reorganisation. Even then, I welcome the

[Sardar Hukum Singh]

Bill and I welcome the Regional Schethat has been offered to us. We will work it to the best of our ability. I appeal again to my friends that in the larger interests of our country we should sit down, confer together and march together.

श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी (नई दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की रिपोर्ट आउट हो कर हमारे सामने आई थी, उसके बाद हम ने देखा कि देश में एक तरह से खलबली मच गई थी । सब लोग इस इंतिजार में थे कि कब राज्य पुनर्गठन बिल हमारे सामने आये और कब हमें पता चले कि आखिरी शक्ल राज्यों की क्या होने वाली है । अब वही राज्य पुनर्गठन बिल इस भवन के सामने पेश कर दिया गया है और उस पर पिछले दो दिनों से बहस हो रही है । राज्यों का पुनर्गठन करने का उद्देश्य क्या है ? पुनर्गठन का उद्देश्य यह है कि ऐसे ढंग से राज्यों की रचना हो कि जिससे राज व्यवस्था पहले से बेहतर हो सके और राज्यों की आर्थिक उन्नति हो सके और राज्य हर तरह से उन्नति कर सकें । एक उद्देश्य यह भी था कि न सिर्फ एक खास राज्य के लोगों की उन्नति हो बल्कि सारे देश की उन्नति हो । अब जो बिल हमारे सामने है, उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए हमें इस बात पर विचार करना है कि क्या इन सब उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति होती है या नहीं । एक सबसे जरूरी चीज यह भी है कि हर एक राज्य के लोगों को स्वशासन का अधिकार भी मिले और प्रजातंत्रात्मक ढंग से किसी एक प्रान्त की हुकूमत चले । अब हमें यह देखना है कि क्या इस बिल के जरिये से यह जो स्वशासन का अधिकार है यह बढ़ता है या घटता है । अगर हम इस आखिरी बात को देखें तो हमें पता चलेगा कि हमारे देश के कई इलाके ऐसे थे जिनमें कि पहले लोगों को स्वशासन का अधिकार था; प्रजातन्त्रात्मक अधिकार था, परन्तु अब उनसे इन अधिकारों को छीना जा रहा है । अब इस राज्य पुनर्गठन बिल से सबसे ज्यादा जिन स्टेट्स (राज्यों) के लोगों को नुकसान पहुंचा है वे पार्ट सी स्टेट्स (ग श्रेणी राज्य) हैं । उन पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को जिन को किसी राज्य में मिलाया जा रहा है और एक बड़ा राज्य बनाया जा रहा है उनके तो प्रजातंत्रात्मक अधिकार कायम है और कायम रहेंगे । उनको एक बड़े प्रान्त के अन्दर कार्य करने का अब मौका मिलेगा लेकिन मैं उन स्टेट्स के बारे में कहती हूं जहां पर कि प्रजातंत्रात्मक अधिकार पहले थे लेकिन अब उनसे इन अधिकारों को छीना जा रहा है और इससे वे बजाय प्रगति करने के पीछे हटाई जा रही हैं । मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अच्छे-अच्छे प्रगतिशील इलाके, प्रगतिशील स्टेट्स जैसे बम्बई है जो कि अब तक पार्ट 'ए' स्टेट में थीं और दिल्ली है जो कि अब तक पार्ट सी स्टेट थी, उनसे वे सब अधिकार छीन लिये जायेंगे जो उनको अब तक प्राप्त थे । अब उनको डी क्लास स्टेट के अधिकार इस बिल के द्वारा प्राप्त होंगे, यह मुझे आपको बताना है । इन इलाकों में हिमाचल प्रदेश भी है । मणीपुर और त्रिपुरा जो पहले से अपने प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकारों के लिये लड़ रहे थे उनको तो वे अधिकार नहीं मिलेंगे, बल्कि दूसरे इलाके के लोगों को जो ये अधिकार हासिल थे उनसे वे छीने जा रहे है । मैं खास कर दिल्ली के बारे में कहूंगी ।

किस वजह से दिल्ली से स्वशासन के और प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार छीने जा रहे हैं ? स्टेटस रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) की रिपोर्ट में इसका एक कारण तो यह दिया गया है कि यह पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है, यहां के लोगों के पास पोलीटिकल ट्रेडीशन (राजनीतिक परम्परा) नहीं है, राजनीतिक अनुभव नहीं है, इसलिये वे अपने राज्य का काम अच्छी तरह से नहीं चला सकते और इस कारण उनसे यह अधिकार छीना जा रहा है । यह बात शायद और किसी इलाके के लिए ठीक हो लेकिन कम से कम दिल्ली के लिये तो यह बात लागू नहीं हो सकती । दिल्ली कोई देहाती इलाका नहीं है । दिल्ली सदियों से हिन्दुस्तान की राजधानी रही है । दिल्ली के लोगों में राजनीति कूट-कूट कर भरी है । आप पुरानी बातें छोड़ दीजिये । आप आज की बात लीजिये । आप सब जानते है कि अभी जो हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई हुई है उसमें दिल्ली के लोगों ने कितना शानदार हिस्स लिया है । वे लोग कुर्बानी देने में किसी से पीछे नहीं रहे, काबलियत में किसी से पीछे नहीं रहे । लेकिन आजाद होने के बाद हमसे राजनीतिक और प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार छीने जा रहे हैं, यह कह कर कि हम पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं और हमें राज्य का काम चलाने का अनुभव नहीं है । मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि जब हम आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे तो दिल्ली के लोग सारे हिन्दुस्तान के नेता बनाये जा सकते थे । लेकिन आज हमारी ऐसी हालत है कि हमारे पास ऐसे नेता भी नहीं हैं जो कि दिल्ली के छोटे से राज्य का काम सुंभाल सकें । इसलिये दिल्ली से स्वशासन का और प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार

छीना जा रहा है । शायद इसका कारण यह है कि दिल्ली की हुकूमत का काम अच्छा नहीं रहा । अगर उनका काम अच्छा रहा होता तो हो सकता है कि स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में कुछ और बात होती । मगर इस वजह से दिल्ली के लोगों को सजा देने का तो कोई कारण नहीं है । अगर दिल्ली की सरकार में अच्छे नेता नहीं आ सके तो इसके लिये दिल्ली कांग्रेस कमेटी का भी कसूर नहीं है, बल्कि इसमें हिन्दुस्तान की कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी (कार्य-कारिणी) का कसूर है कि वह ठीक आदमी नहीं चुन सकी । उनको आदमी चुनते समय इस बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिये था कि वे ऐसे आदमी चुनें जो कि काम संभाल सकें । अगर वे ठीक लोगों को चुनते तो मैं दावे के साथ कह सकती हूं कि दिल्ली में काबिल लोगों की उनको कमी नहीं मालूम होती । दिल्ली में ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं जो यहां के काम को अच्छी तरह से कर सकते थे । दिल्ली में वैसे ही बहुत काबिल आदमी पहले से मौजूद थे । इसके इलावा पिछले सालों में दिल्ली की आबादी बढ़कर दुगनी हो गयी है क्योंकि वैस्ट (पश्चिम) पंजाब से बहुत बड़ी तादाद में लोग यहां पर आ कर बसे हैं । इनमें बहुत से बड़े-बड़े वकील हैं, बड़े-बड़े डाक्टर हैं और बहुत से शिक्षित लोग हैं । अगर आप चाहते तो उनमें से तीन चार ऐसे आदमी आसानी से चुन सकते थे जो कि दिल्ली का काम चला सकते । तो दिल्ली पर यह चीज लागू नहीं हो सकती कि यह पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है इसलिये यहां के स्वशासन के और प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार छीने जा रहे हैं ।

इसी तरह से अगर आज बम्बई को भी इसी हालत में डाला जाता है तो उसके लिये तो यह बात और भी लागू नहीं हो सकती ।

आज अगर आप एक ऐसे इलाके से, जिसमें ८२ परसेंट अरबन (प्रतिशत नागरीय) आबादी है, यह कहें कि तुमको मतदान का अधिकार नहीं है और हम तुमसे स्वशासन का अधिकार छीन रहे हैं, तो ऐसा करके आप प्रगति के बजाय पीछे हटायेंगे । लेकिन आप समझते हैं कि ऐसा करके हम देश को आगे बढ़ायेंगे ।

फिर एक सवाल वायेबिलिटी (अस्तित्व योग्यता) का है, यानी इलाके के पास काफी रुपया होना चाहिये । जिन स्टेट्स के पास काफी रुपया नहीं है उनसे यह अधिकार हटाया जा रहा है । इसका जवाब दिल्ली कांग्रेस कमेटी नें एक छोटा सा पैमफ्लैट निकाल कर अच्छी तरह से दे दिया है । श्री देशबन्धु गुप्ता, जिन्होंनें कि दिल्ली के लिये बड़ी लड़ाई लड़ी थी और जो कि आज हमारे बीच में नहीं है, ने कहा था कि अगर दिल्ली को इनकम टैक्स का और एक्साइज (उत्पादन शुल्क) का उसका पूरा हिस्सा दिया जाये तो उसके पास काफी पैसा हो जायेगा । फिर देखना चाहिये कि दिल्ली में लोकतंत्रात्मक हुकूमत चलाने के लिये कितना खर्चा ज्यादा होता है । दिल्ली की असेम्बली और मिनिस्ट्री (विधान सभा और मंत्रिमंडल) पर सात लाख रुपया सालाना खर्चा होता है जो कि चार आना पर हैड (प्रति व्यक्ति) हर साल आता है । इतने रुपये से दिल्ली स्वशासन को चला सकती है । अब दिल्ली की पुलिस का खर्चा बहुत बढ़ गया है । वह १२ लाख से २० लाख हो गया है । लेकिन यह खर्चा इसलिये बढ़ा है कि दिल्ली राजधानी है और यदि राजधानी होने के कारण यह खर्चा बढ़ा है तो राजधानी को इसमें दिल्ली का हाथ बंटाना चाहिये । उसका जिम्मा दिल्ली स्टेट पर नहीं डाला जाना चाहिये । तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि अगर दिल्ली को उसके हिस्से का पूरा पैसा दिया जाये तो वह अपना काम अच्छी तरह से चला सकती है और आप इस बिना पर भी उसका स्वशासन का और प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार नहीं छीन सकते ।

दिल्ली ने बहुत बड़ी जद्दोजहद के बाद यह अधिकार प्राप्त किया है । इसके लिये सन् १९२८ से लड़ाई चल रही है । उसके बाद सन् १९३० या ३२ में राउंडटेबिल कानफरेंस (गोल मेज सम्मेलन) के दिनों में यह बहुत जोरों से महसूस किया गया कि दिल्ली को अधिकार मिलने चाहियें । उस समय महात्मा गांधी ने खुद दिल्ली को इस बारे में अपना आशीर्वाद दिया । उसके बाद सन् १९४७ में पट्टाभि कमेटी ने इस प्रश्न पर विचार किया और कहा कि दिल्ली को अधिकार मिलना चाहिये । इसके बारे में पहले भी कह चुकी हूं लेकिन मैं इसको फिर इसलिये दुहराये देती हूं कि हमारे अधिकारी कम सुनते हैं । उनको बातें याद नहीं रहती । पट्टाभि कमेटी ने यह कहा था :

> "We are fully alive to the circumstances which led to the formation of Delhi Province in 1912. We also recognise the special importance of Delhi as the capital of the Federation. We are of the opinion that the people of the

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

province which contains the metropolis of India should not be deprived of the right of self-determination enjoyed by the rest of their country-men living in the smallest of villages."

उन्होंने साफ अल्फाज में कहा है कि जो अधिकार आप ग्रामवासियों तक की दे रहे हैं उससे दिल्लीवासियों को क्यों वंचित करते हैं। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो यह अन्याय होगा। इस बारे में आपको कांग्रेस के एक दर्जन रिजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) पढ़ कर सुना सकती हूं जिनमें यही ख्यालात जाहिर किये गये हैं। इस समय मैं केवल सन् १९३८ का एक रिजोल्यूशन कोट करती हूं। वह इस प्रकार है :

"The Congress is not opposed to the idea of Federation; but a real federation must even apart from the question of responsibility, consist of free units enjoying more or less the same measure of freedom and civil liberty and represented by the Democratic process of election."

लेकिन आज वही कांग्रेस दिल्ली को उसके अधिकारों से वंचित करने में आगे बढ़ रही है।

अब दिल्ली के बारे में कुछ प्रेक्टिकल (व्यवहारिक) बातें लीजिये। अगर दिल्ली का लेजिस्लेचर (विधान मंडल) हटा दिया जायेगा तो दिल्ली का काम खत्म नहीं हो जावेगा। दिल्ली की लेजिस्लेटिव जरूरतें खत्म नहीं हो जावेंगी। वह काम पार्लियामेंट (संसद) को करना होगा। लेकिन हम लोग जो कि यहां बैठते हैं यह जानते हैं कि यहां सारे हिन्दुस्तान का काम होता है और उसको बड़ी मुश्किल से खत्म कर पाते हैं। यह पार्लियामेंट जो सारे फेडरेशन का काम करती है वह एक छोटी सी स्टेट का काम कहां तक संभाल सकेगी मैं आपको एक छोटा सा उदाहरण देना चाहती हूं। दिल्ली में इस समय पंजाब के १४३ ऐक्ट प्रामलगेट (प्रस्थापित) हुए हैं और उनसे दिल्ली का काम चल रहा है। आज सुबह स्पीकर (अध्यक्ष) साहब ने कहा था कि पार्लियामेंट के बारे में पंजाब ऐक्ट के मातहत सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध है। अब इन ऐक्ट्स को दोबारा अमेंड (संशोधित) करके पास (पारित) करने की जरूरत है। लेकिन इसको आज तक नहीं किया जा सका है। अब आप बतलाइये कि क्या यह पार्लियामेंट इस काम को कर सकेगी, मैं इस समय और बाकी कानूनों को छोड़ देती हूं जिनकी कि दिल्ली को जरूरत है। कितने साल में पार्लियामेंट इन कानूनों को पास कर सकेगी। नतीजा यह होगा कि दिल्ली का लेजिस्लेटिव काम बहुत पिछड़ा रहेगा।

इसके अलावा लेजिस्लेचर का एक काम यह भी है कि वह एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) के काम की नुक्ताचीनी करे और उसकी खराबियां बतलावे। इस काम का इस पार्लियामेंट को कहां मौका होगा। मैंने दिल्ली के बारे में १५ सवाल दिये पर यहां उनमें से एक भी एडमिट नहीं हुआ। और अगर सवाल एडमिट हो भी जाते हैं तो यहां लिस्ट (सूची) इतनी बड़ी होती है कि उनका नम्बर नहीं आ पाता। न दिल्ली के मामलों को यहां डिसकस (चर्चा) करने का समय मिल सकता है। तो आप चाहे बम्बई को लीजिये या दिल्ली को लीजिये, जो भी एरिया सेंट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड (केन्द्रीय प्रशासित क्षेत्र) होगा उस पर आप ध्यान नहीं दे सकेंगे। इसलिए मैं कहती हूं कि दिल्ली के लिये लेजिस्लेचर की बहुत जरूरत है। मैं पूछती हूं कि आप दिल्ली से डिमाक्रेटिक सैट अप (लोकतंत्रात्मक व्यवस्था) क्यों हटाना चाहते हैं। क्या इसलिये कि यह दिल्ली की बदकिस्मती है कि यहां पर हिन्दुस्तान की राजधानी कायम की गयी है ?

चूंकि दिल्ली सारे भारतवर्ष की राजधानी है इसलिये दिल्ली के निवासियों को इस प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकार से वंचित किया जा रहा है और केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली के ऊपर अपना खास अधिकार रखना चाहती है और दिल्ली को केन्द्र द्वारा प्रशासित करने के पक्ष में वाशिंगटन और कैनबरा के उदाहरण दिये गये लेकिन मैं उनको बतलाना चाहती हूं कि वाशिंगटन और कैनबरा और दिल्ली में बहुत बड़ा फर्क है। दिल्ली आज से इस देश की राजधानी नहीं है बल्कि एक जमाने से वह देश की राजधानी चली आयी है। यहां की तिजारत देश में अपना एक खास स्थान रखती है और दिल्लीवालों से यह डेमोक्रेटिक सेट अप छीन कर आप बड़ा अन्याय कर रहे हैं। फिर सबसे बड़े अफसोस की बात तो यह है कि आपने यह फैसला कर लिया कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स आप खत्म कर देंगे, कुछ बड़ी स्टेटों में मर्ज (संविलीन) हो जायेंगे और बाकी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट टेरिटरीज (केन्द्रीय सरकारी प्रदेश) बन जायेंगे। जिनको कि आप सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की टेरिटरी बनाने वाले हैं वहां के लोगों को कम से कम यह तो मालूम हो जाना चाहिये कि उनका क्या हाल होगा। इस

एस० आर० सी० बिल में कोई चीज ऐसी नहीं दिखाई देती जिससे कि यह मालूम हो सके कि जिन स्टेट्स को खत्म किया जा रहा है उनका क्या हाल होगा ।

दी कांस्टिट्यूशन (नाइंथ अमेंडमेंट) बिल [संविधान (नवां संशोधन) विधेयक] के सफा ६ पर आर्टिकल (अनुच्छेद) २३६ में यह बताया गया है कि यूनियन टेरिटरीज (संघीय प्रदेशों) का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कैसे चलाया जायेगा । आर्टिकल २४० में प्रेसीडेंट (राष्ट्रपति) द्वारा यूनियन टेरिटरीज के लिए रेगुलेशंस (विनियम) बनाने का जिक्र है । इसके अलावा मैं आपका ध्यान और सेलेक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) के मेम्बरों का ध्यान खास तौर से इस बात की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहती हूं कि जो ड्राफ्ट बिल (प्रारूप विधेयक) राज्यों में सर्कुलेट (परिचालित) किया गया वह इस मौजूदा बिल जो कि हाउस के सामने पेश है उसके आर्टिकल २३६ से मुख्तलिफ है । जो सर्कुलेट किया गया था वह इस तरह से था :

> "Save as otherwise provided by Parliament by law, every Union territory shall be administered by the President acting to such extent as he thinks fit, through a Chief Commissioner or other authority to be appointed by him."

लेकिन इसमें आपने जो पार्लियामेंट को अधिकार पहले के मुताबिक हासिल था, उसको इसमें खत्म कर दिया है और उसको एक प्रतिक्रियावादी रूप दिया है । और आपने यह लिखा है :

> "Every Union territory shall be administered by the President acting, to such extent as he thinks fit, through a Chief Commissioner or other authority etc."

पार्लियामेंट के अधिकार की आपने इस में कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रखी । मैं नहीं समझती कि इस तरह की तबदीली जब से आपने इस बिल को सर्कुलेट किया और जब से यह मौजूद बिल हाउस में आया, इस दरमियान में कौन सी ऐसी बात हो गई जिसकी कि वजह से यह तबदीली आपको करनी पड़ी । मुझे तो बिल के उन क्लाजेज (खंडों) को जिनके कि जरिये आप पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट टेरिटरीज बनाने जा रहे हैं और जो कि हमारे ऊपर लागू होने वाले हैं उनको देख कर हैरानी होती है ।

कांस्टिट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल का आर्टिकल २४० इस तरह से है :

> "The President may make regulations for the peace and good government of any Union territory and any regulations so made may repeal or amend any law made by Parliament or any existing law which is for the time being applicable to any such territory and, when promulgated by the President shall have the same force and effect as an Act of Parliament which applies to such territory."

मैं चाहती हूं कि सेलेक्ट कमेटी के मेम्बरान इसके ऊपर गम्भीरता से विचार करें और इस तरह के रिएक्शनरी क्लाज (प्रतिक्रियावादी खंड) मेरी समझ में बिल में नहीं रहना चाहिये इसके जरिये आप पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के अधिकारों को ही नहीं छीन रहे हैं बल्कि आप पार्लियामेंट के भी अधिकार को छीन रहे हैं और उसको भी आप उसके द्वारा लिमिट (सीमित) करने जा रहे हैं । मैं यह कहने के लिये मजबूर हूं कि यह डेमोक्रेसी (प्रजातंत्र) की तरफ प्रगति न होकर आटोक्रेटिक रूल (स्वेच्छाचारी, शासन) की तरफ हम बढ़ रहे हैं । कांस्टिट्यूशन का वह प्राविजो (पराधिक) ८ जो पार्ट डी स्टेट्स पर लागू होता है उसको वहां पर सेक्शन ६ में वर्ड बाई वर्ड (अक्षरशः) लगा दिया है । मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि आखिर पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को जिन्होंने कि अपना राज्य चलाया और जिनको की स्वशासन का अधिकार प्राप्त था, उनको इस अधिकार से वंचित क्यों किया जा रहा है ? अब जहां तक कि अच्छी तरह या बुरी तरह राज्य चलाये जाने का सवाल है तो पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के अलावा क्या और अन्य स्टेट्स नहीं हैं जहां कि शासन ठीक तरह पर न चला हो. . . .

श्री अशोक मेहता (भंडारा) : हिन्दुस्तान का भी राज्य काफी बुरा चलता है ।

श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी : और दूसरी स्टेट्स की बाबत हम अखबारों में पढते हैं कि कितनी शासन के काम में गड़बड़ हो रही है और मेरा तो कहना यह है कि अगर लोकप्रिय शासन दिल्ली का और पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को इसलिये खत्म किया जा रहा है कि वहां पर शासन ठीक तौर पर नहीं चलता है तो पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के अलावा आप पार्ट ए और पार्ट बी स्टेट्स में भी लोकप्रिय शासन को समाप्त कर केन्द्र द्वारा उनका शासन कर सकते हैं । आज पार्ट सी

[सुचेता कृपालानी] :

स्टेट्स को खत्म करके उनको पार्टी डी० स्टेट्स का अधिकार दिया जा रहा है और भविष्य में जो थोड़ा-बहुत प्रोटेक्शन (सुरक्षा) का मौका था उसको इस सेक्शन २३६ के द्वारा हटा दिया गया है ।

दिल्ली को जब से केन्द्र के अधीन लेने की बात चली है तभी से उसके विरोध में दिल्ली की जनता न पबलिक मीटिंग्स के द्वारा तथा अपने लेजिस्लेचर के द्वारा अपना मत प्रदर्शित किया है और केन्द्रीय सरकार के हर प्लेटफार्म से इस बात की अपील की गई है कि वह दिल्ली के निवासियों को लोकतंत्र राज्य से महरूम न करें और ऐसा करके दिल्ली के निवासियों को उनके मतदान के अधिकार से, अपने प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा अपना काम चलाने के अधिकार से वंचित किया जा रहा है ।

श्री अशोक मेहता : खूंरेजी (रक्तपात) कहां की ?

श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी : ठीक है, यह उनकी शायद गलती थी जो उन्होंने शान्तिपूर्ण और वैधानिक उपायों का अवलम्बन किया, क्योंकि अगर खूंरेजी करते और गड़बड़ करते तो शायद उनका काम बन जाता । मैं तो कहूंगी कि दिल्ली के मौजूदा प्रजातांत्रिक ढांचे को तोड़ा न जाय बल्कि दिल्ली जो आज की जरूरत को देखते हुए छोटी हो रही है, आसपास के गांवों को दिल्ली में मिला कर उसका ऐरिया (क्षेत्र) बढ़ाया जाय । उसके आसपास के कुछ इलाके ऐसे हैं जहां के कि लोग रोजाना दिल्ली में अपने काम से आते हैं और उनका काम-धंधा दिल्ली में ही रहता है, उन इलाकों को दिल्ली में शामिल कर लिया जाय और लेजिलेस्चर दिया जाय । लेकिन अगर आप उसको स्वशासन का अधिकार नहीं देना चाहते हैं और यह अधिकार दिल्ली वालों से छीन लेने पर उतारू हो गये हैं तो कम से कम यह तो कीजिये कि जो एडवाइजरी कमेटी (परामर्शदात्री समिति) आप बना रहे हैं वह एलेक्टेड (निर्वाचित) ऐडवाइजरी बाडी हो नामिनेटेड बाडी (नामजद निकाय) मत रखिये । उस एलेक्टेड बाडी को लेजिस्लेटिव पावर्स दीजिये और अगर आप पार्लियामेंट से वह सारा काम करना चाहते हैं तो उन इलाकों के वास्ते पार्लियामेंट में ज्यादा रिप्रेजेंटेशन (प्रतिनिधित्व) और वेटेज मिलना चाहिये ताकि वे उन इलाकों के वास्ते अपनी आवाज उठा सकें और इन्तजार कर सकें ।

दिल्ली के लिये जो कारपोरेशन (निगम) बनना है उसको ऐसा अधिकार देना चाहिये ताकि तमाम लोकल स्टैच्युटरी बाडीज (स्थानीय संविहित निकाय) उसके मातहत हों ताकि कम से कम लोकल गवर्नमेंट (स्थानीय सरकार) का काम वह ठीक तरह से अंजाम दे सके ।

मैं दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और बंबई के ऐसे इलाके जो आज सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट टेरिटरीज में शामिल किये जा रहे हैं और जिनको कि आज बेइज्जत किया जा रहा है और जिनके कि प्रजातांत्रिक अधिकारों को छीना जा रहा है, उनकी तरफ से जबरदस्त प्रोटैस्ट (विरोध) इस हाउस में करना चाहती हूं और सेलेक्ट कमेटी में मेरा अनुरोध है कि वह मेरे सुझावोंपर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करे और उसके अनुसार इस वर्तमान बिल में परिवर्तन करे ।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने अपनी बहन की पुरजोश तकरीर सुनी और दिल्ली में प्रजातांत्रिक ढांचा बनाये रखने के लिये जो जोरदार वकालत की उसको बगौर सुना और मैं भी दिल्ली के वास्ते चन्द अल्फाज अर्ज करना चाहता हूं ।

यह दिल्ली का इलाका सारा का सारा पुराना हरियाना शहर है । आज बम्बई के सवाल को लेकर बहुत से लोग लैंग्वेज (भाषा) का क्वैश्चन (प्रश्न) उठाते हैं और कल श्री फीरोज गांधी ने फरमाया कि बम्बई का हिंटरलैंड (पार्श्वभूमि) सारा का सारा मराठी एरिया (क्षेत्र) है और बम्बई इस तरह बना हुआ है कि उसको महाराष्ट्र में जाना चाहिये । मैं होमलैंड या लैंग्वेज की वजह से किसी स्टेट को बना देने के हक में नहीं हूं लेकिन जैसा कि श्री फीरोज गांधी ने फरमाया मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि दिल्ली के पीछे यह जितना हरियाना का इलाका है वह और इसके अलावा मेरठ, मथुरा यह सारा का सारा पहले एक इलाका था और सन ५७ के गदर म सजा के तौर पर हमको काट कर फेंक दिया गया और यह इलाके जुदा कर दिये गये । यह सारा हिंटरलेन्ड दिल्ली का है ।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

मैं आपको बतलाऊं कि आप इसी से समझ सकते ह कि सन् १९०९ में मैंने यहां आकर प्रैक्टिस शुरू की और १९०२ में मैंने यहीं दिल्ली में इंटरेंस का इम्तिहान दिया क्योंकि मेरा सेंटर (केंद्र)

यहीं था । दिल्ली हरियाने का शहर था । यहां पर हमारा कमिश्नर रहता था और यहां पर हमारा सेशन जज रहता था और यहां पर हम लोग तालीम पाते थे । अब इसकी शक्ल तब्दील हो गई । आज कोई हरियाना वालों की और दिल्ली वालों की बात नहीं सुनता है । आज देहली पूर्ण रूप से बम्बई की तरह Cosmopolitan है । मैं नहीं चाहता कि दिल्ली वालों के जो हक्क हैं वह इस तरह पामाल किये जायें और उनके पास फ्रैंचाइज (मताधिकार) न रहे । जब यह दिल्ली स्टेट बनी तो मैंने अपने मरहूम दोस्त देशबन्धु गुप्त के साथ शाना बशाना इसके लिये कोशिश की । लेकिन आज जब वह दिल्ली स्टेट यहां से जा रही है तो मुझे दुःख होता है कि दिल्ली वालों से उनका फ्रैंचाइज छीना जा रहा है । मुझे उस दिन की भी याद है जब पट्टाभि कमेटी बनी और हमने दिल्ली के कूचे-कूचे में जा कर कौमी झंडा लहराया और कहा कि दिल्ली के लिये भी उसी तरह से फ्रैंचाइज रक्खो जिस तरह से सारे देश के लिये रक्खा है । उसी की वजह से जब पार्ट सी स्टेट्स बनीं तो दिल्ली को भी पार्ट सी स्टेट बनाया गया इसके लिये भी एक इलाज है अपनी बहन की तकरीर सुनकर मैं उनकी खिदमत में वह इलाज पेश करना चाहता हूं, दिल्ली वालों की खिदमत में पेश करना चाहता हूं और गवर्नमेंट के सामने पेश करना चाहता हूं । मुझे यह मालूम है कि गवर्नमेंट को वह इलाज मंजूर नहीं है, मुझे मालूम नहीं कि दिल्ली वालों को भी वह इलाज मंजूर होगा या नहीं और उनका क्या हाल इसके लिये होगा, लेकिन मैं दिल्ली वालों से कहूंगा कि क्यों के तुम अपने पुराने मस्किन पर नहीं जाते, क्यों हरियाना प्रान्त में शामिल नहीं हो जाते, क्यों पंजाब में शामिल नहीं हो जाते ? इसी तरह से मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश वालों के लिये भी कहता हूं क्योंकि मैं वहां की हालत को जानता हूं । आज उनकी हालत को देखकर मुझे बड़ा दुःख होता है, न उनको फ्रचाइज हासिल है और न उनको वह सहूलियतें ही हासिल हैं जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे हिस्सों को हासिल हैं । आज वह यूनियन टेरिटरी की तरह पर बन गई हैं । न उनके पास हाईकोर्ट होगा, न वहां पर कोई पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन रहेगा और न उनके पास फ्रैंचाइज ही रहेगा । मैं नहीं चाहता कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ कोई सख्ती की जाय । एस० आर० सी० की तजवीज थी कि पांच वर्ष के बाद उसको पंजाब के साथ मिला दिया जाय । हिमाचल प्रदेश वालों को उस वक्त जो डर था कि अगर उनको पंजाब के साथ मिला दिया गया, जो कि एक तरक्की करने वाली स्टेट है, तो कहीं ऐसा न हो कि वह पिस जायें, उसको मैं समझ सकता था । यह वही शिकायत थी जो कि हरियाना-वाले करते थे, उनके दिल में भी वही खदशा (आशंका) था, लेकिन आज वह खदशा रहने की जरूरत नहीं है । अभी आप ने हमारे डिप्टी स्पीकर सरदार हुक्मसिंह साहब की तकरीर सुनी है। उनकी तकरीर को सुनकर हिमाचल प्रदेश वालों को जो डर था वह उनको अपने दिल से निकाल देना चाहिये । हिमाचल प्रदेश के लिये बड़ी आसानी से एक तीसरी रीजनल कौंसिल (प्रादेशिक परिषद) बन सकती थी । मुझे मालूम है कि हमारे हिमाचल प्रदेश के ही कई मेम्बरान ने यह दर्खास्त की थी, अब भी एक रिप्रेजेन्टेशन (अभ्यावेदन) की कापी मेरे हाथ में है, जिसमें उन्होंने चाहा था कि जो कुछ पांच वर्ष बाद होना है, उसमें हमारी पोजीशन क्यों खराब करते हो, आज ही हमारा अमलगेमेशन (एकीकरण) कर दो और एक तीसरी रीजनल कौंसिल बना दो । मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूं कि जहां तक हरियाना प्रान्त और अकालियों का सवाल है वह हर्गिज-हर्गिज इसमें रोड़ा नहीं अटकायेंगे । उनका सारा मामला अब खत्म हो चुका है , हम चाहते हैं कि पंजाब बड़ा बने और जो भी हिस्सा पंजाब में आयेगा हम नहीं चाहते कि किसी तरह से उनके बखिलाफ काम करें और वहां पर किसी किस्म की कंट्रोवर्सी (वाद प्रतिवाद) हो । आज पंजाब में किसी के साथ बेइन्साफी नहीं हो रही है, सबके साथ न्याय हो रहा है । अब पंजाब नाम का सूबा बन गया है, अगर वहां पर हिमाचल प्रदेश शामिल हो जाता है तो उसके साथ भी जहां तक हमारा काबू है, हम कोई बेइन्साफी नहीं होने देंगे । आज एस० आर० सी० ने जो सिफारिशें की थीं, वह मौजूद हैं । उन्होंने कहा था कि वहां इंटरनेशनल फ्रंटियर (अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सीमान्त) है । पंजाब में एक ऐसा फ्रंटियर है जिसको कि बहुत मजबूत होने की जरूरत है । जैसी कि आप उम्मीद करते हैं वहां का एक-एक पंजाबी अपने देश के बचाव के लिये अपनी जान दे देगा । वह किसी तरह से भी हिमाचल प्रदेश के मिल जाने से कमजोर नहीं होगा, अगर होगा तो मजबूत ही होगा । एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट में सारी बातें दर्ज हैं । इसके अलावा भाखड़ा डैम में हम क्या देखते हैं, बिलासपुर के लोग जो वहां से चले गये वह पंजाब में आकर बसते हैं । सारी बातें जब इस तरह से हो रही हैं तो मैं कोई वजह नहीं देखता कि हिमाचल को पंजाब के साथ न शामिल किया जा सके । हिमाचल की सारी

[पंडित ठाकूर दास भार्गव]

जिन्दगी हमारे साथ वाबस्ता है । क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूं कि जब दार्जिलिंग का इन्तजाम बंगाल गवर्नमेंट कर सकती है, आसाम के पहाड़ी इलाकों का इन्तजाम आसाम वाले कर सकते हैं, यू० पी० के हिली रीजन्स (पर्वतीय प्रदेशों) का इन्तजाम यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट कर सकती है, तो क्या पंजाब हमारा ऐसा है कि वह हिमाचल प्रदेश का, जो कि हमेशा से उसके साथ रहा है, का इन्तजाम नहीं कर सकता है । अगर आपकी नियत यह है कि पांच वर्ष बाद आप उसको पंजाब में शामिल करें तो उसको आज ही कर दें । आप अपनी एड (सहायता) कायम रखें क्योंकि मैं चाहता हूं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सारे हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसा पनपे जैसी कोई स्टेट न पनपी हो, उसको जितनी ही एड दी जाय वह ठीक है और हम उसके हक में है, लेकिन हिमाचल प्रदेश को अलग रखने से कोई फायदा नहीं है । जब यही पालिसी आप की तेलंगाना के सम्बन्ध में रही और उसको आपने शामिल कर दिया तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि हिमाचल के साथ आप दूसरा सलूक करें । इसमें हिमाचल का भी नुकसान है और हमारा भी । मैं आपको अजमेर की हालत बतलाता हूं । सरदार पटेल ने अजमेर वालों से कहा था कि तुम राजस्थान में मिल जाओ, लेकिन उन लोगों ने नहीं माना और वैसा नहीं हो सका । आज हम देखते हैं कि वह बड़ी तकलीफ में हैं और महसूस करते हैं कि अगर पहले ही वह राजस्थान में शामिल हो गये होते तो शायद अजमेर ही राजधानी बन गया होता, जयपुर न होता । इस लिये हिमाचल प्रदेश को शामिल करने का यही मौका है और सारे के सारे पंजाबी इसको वेलकम (स्वागत) करेंगे । कोई भी उनमेंसे इसके बखिलाफ नहीं है ।

आचार्य कृपालानी (भागलपुर व पूर्निया) और दिल्ली को कैपिटल (राजधानी) कर दो ।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मुझे इस में कोई एतराज नहीं है । एस० आर० सी० के सामने भी मेरी यही स्कीम थी कि सारे पंजाब सारे पेप्सू, हिमाचल, मेरठ और आगरा के डिवीजन और दिल्ली का यह इलाका सबके सब शामिल कर दिये जायें । मेरा अब भी यह कहना है कि तीन करोड़ से कम आबादी का इलाका पंजाब का नहीं होना चाहिये था, क्योंकि मैं यहां हाउस में देखता हूं कि हम तो पंजाब की बात करते रहे, आपस में लड़ते-झगड़ते रहे, आल इंडिया बेसिस (अखिल भारतीय आधार) पर, और पंजाब और पेप्सू के जो मेम्बर यहां बैठे हैं उनकी All India मामलों में कोई बात नहीं पूछता । इस वक्त पंजाब की गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया में कोई आवाज नहीं है । मैं इसको महसूस करता हूं कि जो छोटे इलाके हैं उनकी फिल वाक्या कोई वायस (आवाज) यहां पर नहीं है । इसलिये जो यह जोनल स्कीम आई है, उसको मैं बड़ी अच्छी समझता हूं । मुझे इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं है कि दिल्ली और हिमाचल प्रदेश पंजाब में शामिल हो जायें । कैपिटल के सवाल पर हमें झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहिये । आप पटियाला को कैपिटल बना दें, मुझे कोई उज्र नहीं, या जैसा कृपालानी साहब ने कहा, आप दिल्ली को कैपिटल बना दें, मुझे उसमें भी कोई एतराज नहीं है । लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा.....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले शामिल तो हो जाने दीजिये, कैपिटल का फैसला फिर हो जायेगा ।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अब मैं जो नई तजवीज बनी है उसके बारे में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं । सरदार हुक्म सिंह ने इसकी वजाहत बड़े अच्छे और खूबसूरत अल्फाज में कर दी है । पिछली मर्तबा जब मैं एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट पर बोला था उस वक्त मैंने अर्ज किया था, कसरदार साहब कहते थे कि उनके बड़े भाई की इच्छा नहीं है और बड़े भाई का कुसूर है कि उनकी बातों को नहीं मानते । उस वक्त मैंने अर्ज किया था कि जहां तक हिन्दुओं का सवाल है या सिखों का सवाल है हरियाना प्रान्त के लिये वह कहावत के मुताबिक क्रेग्ज व बेग्ज का असर, रेग्ज जैसा है (Effect of Crags and bags upon rags,) मैं अब तक सिखों को चचा कहता था और चौधरी रणवीर सिंह, जिनको सरदार साहब बड़े भाई कहते हैं, उनको ताऊ कहते थे । पिछले १०० वर्षों में सारे हरियाना प्रान्त में जो चीज होती थी वह पंजाबी मुसलमानों को मिलती थी जो कि कुल ५६ फीसदी थे क्योंकि उनकी हुकूमत थी । जो बाकी बचता था वह हमारे सिख भाइयों को, जो कि हमारे पंजाबी भाइयों के ताऊ हैं, मिलता था । मक्खन और मलाई उनके पास चला जाता था । बाकी जो छांछ बच रहती थी उस पर हमारा गुजारा चलता था । लेकिन बावजूद इसके हम में कोई इन्फीरियारिटी कामप्लेक्स (हीनता की मनोवृत्ति) नहीं आया है । हमारे सरदार हुक्म सिंह साहब ने तो मेरी ताईद

की थी जब मैंने २३ दिसम्बर को सारे फिगर्स हाउस में दिये थे कि हमारे साथ १०० वर्षों में कितना जुल्म किया गया । लेकिन आज जब यह रीजनल स्कीम आई है, जहां तक हरियाना प्रान्त का सवाल है, वह भी इससे खुश हैं, अकाली भाई भी इससे खुश हैं और इस मौके का फायदा उठाते हुए मैं अपने सिख भाइयों को फिल वाकया मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूं । आज मैं इस झगड़े में नहीं जाना चाहता कि पंजाब सूबे का मुतालबा ठीक था या नहीं, लेकिन जो यह रीजनल स्कीम है उसको हमने मंजूर किया है और उसको अमल में लाने के लिये तैयार हैं । मान लीजिये, जैसा कि हमारे सिख भाई फरमाते हैं, कि इसलिये कुबूल किया कि इस वक्त देश के मामलात नाजुक हैं, इस वास्ते मैं और भी मुबारकबाद देता हूं । अगर यह स्कीम दुरुस्त है तब तो कोई बात ही नहीं है, लेकिन अगर दुरुस्त नहीं है और ऐसी हालत में भी वह स्कीम को मंजूर करते हैं, तो मैं उनको और भी मुबारक बाद देना चाहता हूं । पंजाब के अन्दर वही सोल्यूशन (समाधान) कामयाब हो सकता है जिसे पंजाब के लोग ज्यादा दुरुस्त समझें । रीजनल स्कीम की जो डिटेल्ज (ब्योरा) हैं वह बिल्कुल अंधेरे में हैं जिसको हम नहीं जानते हैं कि क्या होगा, शायद पंजाब स्टेट के अंदर भी बहुत थोड़े लोग होंगे जो इसके फुल इमप्लीकेशन्स (पूरे-पूरे उपलक्षणों) को जानते होंगे, गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के भी बहुत ज्यादा लोग इसको नहीं जानते होंगे । लेकिन एक बात जो साफ है कि जो स्कीम बडी है उसने पंजाब की यूनिटी (एकता) को कायम रक्खा है । जहां तक पंजाब की जनता का सवाल है, वह भी यूनिटी की कद्र करते हैं और वह भी उस पर पूरा भरोसा रखते हैं । लेकिन यह जो तीसरा बाकी तबका है, यह थोड़ा सा नाराज मालूम पड़ता है । लेकिन जैसा कि सरदार हुक्म सिंह जी ने कहा और अपील की कि सब तबके अपनी अपोजीशन (विरोध) को छोड़ दें मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूं । लेकिन मैं किसी को कंडेम (निन्द) न करते हुए यह अर्ज करता हूं कि जो लोग इस की मुखालिफत करते हैं, उनके अपने इंटिरेस्ट (हित) है और अपने इंटरेस्टस को वे भली भांति जानते हैं । हमें उन्हें भी सहयोग से राजी रखना है । लेकिन साथ ही मास्टर तारा सिंह साहब ने और सरदार हुक्म सिंह साहब ने और दूसरे भाइयों ने जो यह कहा कि हिन्दू सिख मिल कर रहें और अपने सब तफरकात (मतभेद) मिटा दें, मैं इसको वेलकम करता हूं । यह ठीक बात है और हमें इस पर चलने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और आपस में मिल जुल कर रहना चाहिये । यह जो स्कीम तैयार की गई है अगर इसको ठीक तरह से वर्क (कार्यान्वित) किया गया तो मैं यकीन के साथ कह सकता हूं कि पंजाब का हर आदमी सैटिसफेक्शन फील (सन्तोष अनुभव) करेगा । लेकिन अभी तो मुझे पता नहीं वह पूरी स्कीम अमल में क्या होगी । इतना ही कह सकता हूं कि इसके जो प्रिंसिपल्स (सिद्धान्त) हैं, उनको मैं मानता हूं । लेकिन एक बात जो सरदार हुक्म सिंह जी ने कही वह मुझे बहुत अच्छी लगी । उन्होंने जीयो और जीने दो का प्रिंसिपल हमारे सामने रखा । उन्होंने कहा कि हम किसी पर डौमिनेट (प्रभुत्व स्थापित) करना नहीं चाहते लेकिन साथ ही हम यह भी नहीं चाहते कि कोई हम पर डौमिनेट करे । यह असल चीज है और अगर इस पर अमल किया जायगा तो मुझे यकीन है हमारी कठिनाइयां बहुत हद तक हल हो जायेंगी । जब कोई किसी पर डॉमिनेट करना शुरू कर देता है तो समझ लीजिये कि कोई खराबी होने वाली है और उस स्टेट की पीस (शान्ति) खतरे में है ।

अब जो तफरकात हैं उनको सेटल (निबटारा) करने के बारे में जाहिर ऐसा होता है कि दूसरे बिल में इतना लिखा है कि गवर्नमेंट ऐसे रूल्स आफ बिजिनेस (कार्य संचालन नियम) बनायेगी जिसके जरिये से इस स्कीम को कार्यान्वित किया जायेगा । लेकिन मैं यह भी देखता हूं कि एक बार इस हाउस में हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक इंकलिंग (संकेत) दिया था कि अगर रिजंस (प्रदेशों) के अन्दर और स्टेट के अन्दर कोई झगड़ा होगा तो गवर्नर को अख्तियार होगा कि वह उसको रिजाल्व (निबटारा) कर दे । आज मैं जब एक इस बिल की दफा २१ को पढ़ता हूं तो वहां पर यह लिखा हुआ पाता हूं कि लिंग्विस्टिक माइनारिटी का अगर कोई झगड़ा होगा तो वह जोनल काउंसिल के पास जायेगा और जोनल काऊंसिल उस पर विचार करेगी । मैं नहीं जानता कि एक तो जोन बन गए, एक तरफ स्टेट बन गई, उस स्टेट के ऊपर एक जोनल काउसिल बन गई और इस सारे के ऊपर शायद गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया बैठी हुई है, अब कौन इन झगड़ों का फैसला करेगा, किस तरह से एक चीज किस के पास आयेगी, इसके बारे में आपके यह दोनों जो बिल हैं ये साइलेंट (चुप) हैं । इस वास्ते मुझे डर है कि किस तरह से इस स्कीम को वर्क किया जायेगा । मुझे गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया में, अपनी पंजाब स्टेट में और सब से ज्यादा पंजाब के रहने वालों

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव] :

में पूरा यकीन है कि वे इस चीज को जो कि उनके लिये बिल्कुल नई है, इस तरह से चलायेंगे जिससे कि सबको एबसोल्यूट सैटिसफेक्शन (पूर्ण सन्तुष्टि) हो और किसी तरह की कम्पलीकेशंस (पेचीदगी) पैदा न हों।

यह जो आपकी एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट है, इस पर मैंने अपने प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के, अपने होम मिनिस्टर साहब के तथा दूसरों के भाषण सुने हैं। सबने ही लिंग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज (भाषायी अल्पसंख्यको) के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा है और उनकी सेफगार्डस (संरक्षणों) के बारे में बहुत सी बातें हमें सुनने को मिली हैं। इस सिलसिले में मैं भी आज इस हाउस में थोड़ा सा कहना चाहता हूं। यह जो हर रोज कहा जाता है कि हमें अपनी स्टेट की तरफ, अपने शहर की तरफ और अपने गांव की तरफ न देखकर तमाम हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ देखना चाहिये, तमाम हिन्दुस्तान की उन्नति हो, इस तरफ देखना चाहिये, इसको मैं ठीक मानता हूं। जो हमें सिटिजनशिप (नागरिकता) मिली है वह हिन्दुस्तान की सिटिजनशिप है, किसी स्टेट की नहीं है। मैं आपको उन इलाकों के बारे में बतलाना चाहता हूं जो इलाके पिछड़े हुए हैं। मैं उन लोगों की बात नहीं करता जो पिछड़े हुए हं मैं उन इलाकों की बात करता हूं जो पिछड़े हुए हैं और जहां पर ठीक हालत नहीं है। उन इलाकों की हालत ऐसी नहीं है जैसी हालत की बाकी हिन्दुस्तान की है। उन इलाकों की ऐसी दशा देखकर मुझे बहुत दुख होता है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि आप उन इलाकों को क्या सेफगार्डस देने का विचार कर रहे हैं? इसके बारे में मैंने पहले भी अर्ज किया था और आज फिर अर्ज करता हूं कि अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि हर एक पहले हिन्दुस्तान का खयाल करे तो आपको कुछ और चीजें करनी होंगी। मैंने देखा है कि चने का भाव मद्रास में ४२ रुपये फी मन है कलकत्ता में २० रुपया फी मन है, दिल्ली में १४ रुपया फी मन है और हिसार में ६ रुपया फी मन रहा है। जब ऐसी चीज है, जब एक जगह भाव इतने ऊंचे हैं और दूसरी जगह इतने नीचे हैं तो आप यह कैसे कह सकते हैं, कि हर एक यह समझे कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान का शहरी हूं। इस वास्ते मैं बड़े अदब से गुजारिश करता हूं कि पहली चीज जो आपको करनी चाहिए वह यह है कि जितनी निसेसरीज आफ लाइफ (जीवन आवश्यकताएं) हैं उन सबके भाव ट्रांसपोर्ट का खर्चा निकाल कर, तमाम हिन्दुस्तान में एक से होने चाहिएं ताकि लोग यह समझ सकें कि भाखड़ा डैम की वजह से पंजाब की जो पैदावार बढ़ी है और वहां पर जो भाव सस्ते हुए हैं उसे त्रावणकोर कोचीन के लोगों को भी फायदा पहुंचा है, रायल सीमा के लोगों को भी फायदा पहुंचा है। हमारा देश एक है और कम से कम खाने पीने की चीजों की कीमतें तो यकसां होनी चाहियें। अगर आप लिंग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीस को और बैकवर्ड एरियाज (पिछड़े क्षेत्र) को मिनिमम सेफगार्डस (न्यनतम संरक्षण) दें तो ही मैं समझूंगा कि आप अपने ध्येय की प्राप्ति की ओर कदम उठा रहे हैं।

अब मिनिमम एमैनिटीस (न्यूनतम सुभीते) क्या होती है। इसके बारे में मैंने पिछली बार भी कहा था कि पंजाब में ही जालन्धर डिवीजन और हरियाना प्रान्त में रात दिन का फर्क है। जितनी एजुकेशनल इंस्टीट्यशंस उनके पास हैं उनके मुकाबले में अशरोअशीर भी हमारे पास नहीं हैं। जितनी सड़कें उनके पास हैं, उसके मुकाबले में कुछ भी हमारें पास नहीं हैं। नौकरियों के बारे में भी मैंने पिछली बार कहा था कि एक भी डेपुटी कमिश्नर या सुपरिंटेंडेंट आफ पुलिस हरियाना प्रान्त का पंजाब में नहीं है। इसी तरह से मैंने दूसरी नौकरियों के बारे में कहा था और यह सब चीजें इस पार्लियामेंट की २३ दिसम्बर की किताब (Proceeding) में दर्ज हैं और जो माननीय सदस्य देखना चाहें वह मेरे पास आकर देख सकते हैं। खैर जो कुछ हो गया, हो गया लेकिन आगे के लिए अगर आप हमें ईक्वल फुटिंग (समान आधार) पर रखना चाहते हैं, हमें इक्वैलिटी देना चाहते हैं और हमें आप चाहते हैं कि हम कम्पीट (प्रतियोगिता) करके नौकरियां हासिल करें, और कोई प्रेफ्रेंशल ट्रीटमेंट (अधिमान्य व्यवहार), हमारा इलाका एक पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका होने की वजह से, आप नहीं देना चाहते तो मुझे महात्मा गांधी की वह बात याद आ जाती है जब अंग्रेजों ने उनसे कहा था कि तजारत के मामले में अंग्रेजों और हिन्दुस्तानियों में फर्क नहीं होना चाहिये और दोनों को एक ही बेसिस पर रखा जाना चाहिए, तो उन्होंने इसके जवाब में यह कहा था कि चुंटी और हाथी की बराबरी क्या। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हम १५ साल के बाद या १० साल के बाद नौकरियों के काबिल बनें अधैर कम्पीट करने के काबिल बनें तो इंसाफ की बात यह होगी कि आप अगले दस सालों के लिए कम से कम ३/४ रिक्रूटमेंट उन इलाकों से करें जो महरूम रखे गये हैं और जो कि पिछड़े हुए

हैं। मैं किसी खास इलाके के बारे में नहीं कहता, मैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के उन तमाम इलाकों के बारे में कहता हू जो पिछड़े हुए हैं जो बैकवर्ड हैं। जहां पर आपने लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज के लिए सेफगार्ड की बात की है कि वहां पर आपको बैकवर्ड एरियाज को भी जरूर शामिल करना चाहिए। आपको सब स्टेट्स के लिये यह अनिवार्य कर देना चाहिये कि जितनी भी रिक्रटमेंट वे करें कम से कम अगले पांच बरसों तक उन इलाकों से अवश्य करें जो कि पिछड़े हुए हैं ताकि वे इलाके अगल १०-१५ सालों में यह कहने के काबिल हो सकें कि अब हमें कोई सेफगार्ड की जरूरत नहीं है, अब हम ऐसे आदमी पैदा कर सकते हैं जो कि कम्पीट कर सकते हैं, और हम सब हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की भलाई में ही हमारी भलाई है।

अब जो पंजाब का पुनर्गठन हो रहा है उसमें हिन्दी स्पीकिंग पापुलेशन (हिन्दी भाषी जनता) माइनोरिटी (अल्प संख्या) में हो जायेगी। आज तक तो हिन्दी बोलने वाले ७० फीसदी थे लेकिन अब उनकी तादाद सिर्फ ५५ लाख रह जायगी। अब हम लिग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटी की कलास में होंगे। मैं पंजाबी और हिन्दी में कोई भेदभाव नहीं करता। मैं इस झगड़े में पड़ना भी नहीं चाहता। मेरी शिकायत यह नहीं है कि क्योंकि इसको किसी जोन की भाषा बनाया जा रहा है। मैं तो सिर्फ यह चाहता हूं कि जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं उनके बारे में यह कह दिया जाए कि जहां तक डिवेलेपमेंट का सवाल है उसको इसमें एक मुनासिब ज्यादा रिप्रेजेन्टेशन सड़कों तालीमी अदारों आबपाथी व नौकरी वगैरा में दी जावे ताकि यह न हो कि आइंदा भी हम इस प्रान्त के अन्दर एक सिंडरीला (अपेक्षित व्यक्ति) ही रहें।

लैंगुएज (भाषाओं) के बारे में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मैंने पिछली बार भी कहा था कि जहां तक हिन्दी और पंजाबी का सवाल है इन दोनों में कोई लम्बा चौड़ा फर्क नहीं है। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि लोगों को पंजाबी भी पढ़नी चाहिये और हिन्दी भी, तो मैं इसकी मुखालिफत नहीं करता हूं। हमें पंजाबी पढ़ने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिये अगर हमने पंजाब में रहना है। इसी तरह से वहां पर लोगों को हिन्दी पढ़ने में भी कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिए। मैं तो दूसरे प्रान्तों के उन लोगों की तारीफ करता हूं जिनकी मातृभाष हिन्दी न होते हुए भी जो कि हिन्दी पढ़ने और हिन्दी बोलने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। अगर हमारे इलाके के अन्दर लोग पंजाबी पढ़ें तो मुझे इसमें कोई एतराज नहीं होगा, बल्कि खुशी ही होगी। लेकिन जहां मैं यह कहता हूं वहां मैं अपने सिख भाइयों से यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक लैंगुएज का सवाल है उसके लिए दफा ३४७ एप्लाई (लागू) करती है। उसमें लिखा है कि स्पौकन लेंगुएज के बारें में अगर प्रेजीडेंट साहब चाहें तो यह कह सकते हैं कि इस लैंगुएज को इस इलाके में रायज कर दिया जाए। यह कहा जाता है कि सिख भाई हिन्दी पढ़ेंगे और हिन्दू भाई पंजाबी पढ़ेंगे इस वास्ते दोनों रलमिल जायंगे। यह बात ठीक है। जहां तक मातृ-भाषा का ताल्लुक है आपने एमेंडिंग बिल में लिखा है कि प्राइमेरी में बच्चों को उनकी मातृभाषा में ही तालीम दी जायगी। यह ठीक चीज है। अब सवाल आगे का रह जाता है। मैं यह चाहता हूं कि जहां तक मैट्रिकुलेशन एग्जेमिनेशन का ताल्लुक है किसी भी लड़के के लिए चाहे वह इस एरिया में रहता हो या उस एरिया में पंजाबी में या हिन्दी में मैट्रिकुलेशन पास करना जरूरी नहीं होना चाहिए। इन दोनों में से किसी भी एक भाषा में वह एंट्रेंस पास कर सकता है। अगर वह नौकरी चाहेगा तो वह अपने आप उस भाषा को पढ़ेगा और सीखेगा जो कि उस नौकरी को हासिल करने के लिए जरूरी है। इससे कोई भी नुकसान नहीं होगा। एक मामूली आदमी के लिए इन दोनों जबानों में मैट्रिकुलेशन का इम्तिहान पास करना मुश्किल होगा।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक लैंगुएज का ताल्लुक है ३४७ दफा ही लागू होती है लेकिन उसमें स्क्रिप्ट (लिपि) की कोई बात नहीं कही गयी है।

मैंने पिछली दफा भी अर्ज किया था कि आप सारे कांस्टीट्यूशन को पढ़ जाइये। इसमें स्क्रिप्ट के प्रोटेक्शन के लिए यही दिया गया है कि अगर कोई माइनारिटी चाहे तो अपने स्क्रिप्ट को बचा ले। तो मुझे गुरुमुखी से नफरत नहीं है। हमारे सिख भाई जिस चीज को मुतबर्रक समझते हैं उससे मुझे कोई रिपगनेन्स (विरुद्ध) नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह ठीक नहीं समझता कि आप एक इलाके को मजबूर करें कि वह पंजाबी भाषा में जो भी लिखे वह गुरुमुखी में लिखे, इसको मैं मुनासिब नहीं समझता। मैं मेरठ के इलाके के पास का रहने वाला हूं। दिल्ली मेरे पास का इलाका है। आप दफा १४

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

के मुताबिक मेरठ और दिल्ली पर यह चीज इम्पोज (थोपना) क्यों नहीं करते । हरियाने वालों की वही पोजीशन (स्थिति) है जो कि मेरठ और दिल्ली वालों की है । लेकिन मैं अपने ऊपर यह आयद करता हूं कि चूंकि मैं पंजाब में रहता हूं इसलिये मुझे पंजाबी सीखनी चाहिए । लेकिन मैं चाहता हूं कि वह देवनागरी स्क्रिप्ट में लिखी जाये । मैं तो चाहता हूं कि बंगाली, मराठी और गुजराती वगैरह सब की सब देवनागरी स्क्रिप्ट में लिखी जायें । एक बार मेरे एक दोस्त ने मुझे हिन्दी स्क्रिप्ट में लिखी हुई बंगाली भाषा दिखायी, मैंने उसमें से उसे पढ़कर आधी बात समझ ली । आज सारे देश में यह मूवमेंट (आन्दोलन) चल रहा है कि सारी भाषायें देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी जायें । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस वक्त यह जिद करना मुनासिब नहीं है कि अगर पंजाब में पंजाबी भाषा में कोई कुछ लिखे तो वह गुरुमुखी में ही लिखे मैं हरगिज गुरुमुखी के खिलाफ नहीं हूं लेकिन आप इसको इस नुक्ते ख्याल से देखें । मैं गुरुमुखी को सीखने के खिलाफ नहीं हूं । लेकिन मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि आप देखें कि अब तक पंजाबी किस स्क्रिप्ट में लिखी जाती थी । वह या तो उर्दू स्क्रिप्ट में लिखी जाती थी या देवनागरी में । जब हमारे सिख भाइयों ने यह ऐलान किया है कि न हम किसी से डामिनेट होना चाहते हैं और न किसी को डामिनेट (प्रभुत्ता में लाना) करना चाहता हैं तो मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि वे इस बात की इजाजत दें कि पंजाबी जबान को हिन्दी स्क्रिप्ट में लिखा जाये ।

मुझे तो इस बात पर गुरूर है कि मेरी गीता कितनी जबानों में लिखी गई है । आज ऐसी कौन सी भाषा है जिसमें कि बाइबिल नहीं लिखी गयी है । मैं तो कहता हूं कि हमारे गुरुओं की वाणी और उसके अलावा जो कुछ भी सेक्रेड (पवित्र) है वह सब की दौलत है, उसको हर जबान में लिखा जाना चाहिए, किसी को उसका ठेकेदार नहीं बनना चाहिए । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि मेरे इलाके के लोग इस बात से खुश नहीं होंगे न इसको कबूल करेंगे कि हिन्दी पढ़ने वाले लड़कों को एंट्रेंस का इम्तिहान पंजाबी में पास करना पड़े और पंजाबी की लिपि सिर्फ गुरुमुखी हो । यह उनको नापसन्द होगा । इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि इस किस्म की चीज पंजाब में न रखी जाय । यही तरमीम मैं चाहता हूं ताकि सब लोग जो कुछ किया जा रहा है उसको खुशी खुशी मंजूर कर लें ।

पंजाब में एक सच्चर फार्मूला था और दूसरा एक फार्मूला पेप्सू में चलता था । लेकिन मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि कम से कम यूनीफार्मिटी के लिहाज से आप ऐसा तो न कीजिये कि एक ही खित्ते में अलग अलग किस्म का फारमूला चले । मैं उन दोनों फार्मूलों में इस वक्त नहीं जाना चाहता । मैं जो तरमीम चाहता हूं वह मैंने अर्ज कर दी है

मैंने सरदार साहब का भाषण सुना । जो कुछ वह पेप्सू के बारे में कहते हैं मैं उससे सहमत हैं । लेकिन उनको यह कतई ख्याल नहीं करना चाहिए कि पंजाब से मिलकर वे कुछ खो रहे हैं । मैं इस सिलसिले में सबसे पहले महाराजा साहब पटियाला की मुबारकबाद देता हूं । अगर इस सिलसिले में किसी का नुकसान हुआ है, अगर किसी ने सबसे बड़ा सैक्रीफाइज (त्याग) किया है तो वह महाराजा पटियाला हैं । उनकी सारी हुकूमत चली गयी । उन्होंने मुल्क के लिए सन् १९४७ से लेकर आज तक जो कुर्बानी की उसके लिए मैं उनको मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूं ।

सड़के बाद हाईकोर्ट का सवाल मेरे सामने आता है । आपने जोधपुर के लिए और केरल के लिए जो हाईकोर्ट रखे हैं उनमें जजों को सिर्फ तीन हजार रुपये महीना मिलेगा । पेप्सू में तो उनको शायद १,२०० ही मिलता है । लेकिन मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि पेप्सू की जजेज की सर्विसेज देखी जायें और जो उनमें से काबिल हों उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा जगहें दी जायें । उनके साथ बेइन्साफी नहीं होनी चाहिए । इसी तरह मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जोधपुर और केरल के मामले में आप एक पोलीटिकल मिस्टेक (राजनीतिक भूल) न करें । मैंने जोधपुर के हाईकोर्ट में प्रेक्टिस की है और मैं वहां के जजेज को ट्रीब्यूट (श्रद्धांजलि) अदा करना चाहता हूं । वे काबिलियत में किसी हाईकोर्ट के जज से कम नहीं हैं । वहां की बार भी बहुत मजबूत है । यह मुनासिब नहीं कि आप वहां के जजों को तीन हजार रुपया दें, खास तौर से जब कि आप कहते हैं कि हम उनके ट्रांस्फर भी करते रहेंगे ।

इसी तरह से पेप्सू वालों को शिकायत है स्पीकर और डिप्टी स्पीकर के मामले में । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जिस वक्त असेम्बली बैठे आप सारे मेम्बरों को स्पीकर और डिप्टी स्पीकर को चुनने का अख्तियार दीजिये । आप उनको इस हक से महरूम (वंचित) न कीजिये जिससे कि उनको यह ख्याल न हो कि उनको

नुकसान हुआ । मैं चाहता हूं कि ये जितनी बातें इनफीरियारिटी कम्प्लेक्स (हीन भाव) को पैदा करने वाली हैं उनको आप निकाल दीजिये और ठीक से इन्तिजाम कीजिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am proposing to call Shri Kasliwal. But, before that, I want to have the permission of the House to reduce the time. Otherwise, Members who are very anxious to speak will be disappointed. I think, Members should be content with 10 minutes.

Then, again, there is the authority vested in the Chair; but, Members should co-operate. When the bell rings, they should at least take notice of it. Members do not care about that and it causes some inconvenience. I do not want that it shall be rung again and again.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): May I say that not even one Member from our areas has been able to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have absolutely no objection to allowing Members to speak for a longer period, be it 25 or 30 minutes; if the House so wants it, I have no objection.

Shri Keshavaiengar (Bangalore North): Members from Karnataka and Mysore have not been given any opportunity.

Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore—Reserved —Sch. Castes): No Congress Member from Mysore has been given any opportunity to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are transgressing party affiliations. I will take note of the objections taken.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah-Jhalawar): I have been waiting for this opportunity and I will assure you that as far as possible I will not transgress the limits of time which you have imposed just now when I have begun to speak. I would not have taken part in this debate but for this fact that not a single Member from Rajasthan has been taken in the Joint Committee and, because certain developments have taken place, I think, it was necessary for a Member from Rajasthan at least to go on record (*Interruption*). You will hear it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like the hon. Member not to care for these interruptions.

Shri Kasliwal: I had taken part in the marathon debate, as the Home Minister has been pleased to say, on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission, and spoken on behalf of my State of Rajasthan. Perhaps, I need hardly have taken part today, because I feel that the shape of Rajasthan, so far as this Bill is concerned, has not changed from the recommendations of the Commission, which have been, more or less implemented in this respect, except with regard to Loharu.

So far as Loharu is concerned, I shed no tears. It is said that there has been general agreement that it should remain in Punjab. So far so good. I am happy at the thought that my Punjabi friends who may be anxious for the retention of Loharu in Punjab are happy.

I am constrained to take part in this debate because of certain doings of a neighbouring State. I refer to the doings of the Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat. When I read in the papers that the Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat had sent a letter to the Home Ministry of the Government of India asking for certain areas of Rajasthan to be incorporated in the State of Madhay Bharat, which is already in a process of disintegration, dissolution and abolition, I was very much amazed. I thought that probably the reports were wrong. But when I went through the proceedings of the Madhya Bharat Legislature on this Bill, my worst fears were confirmed. I am really surprised at the method which the Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat has been adopting for acquiring certain areas of Rajasthan. He has not come in the Madhya Bharat Assembly with any amendment. He has not said anything about the acquisition of certain areas of Rajasthan in any public meeting. All that he has done is to write a letter to the hon. Home Minister that certain areas which belong to Rajasthan should now be incorporated in Madhya Bharat. Do you know why he has not done so? It is because the people of Madhya Bharat are against acquiring any area of Rajasthan. The M. L. As. of Madhya Bharat are against acquiring any territory of Rajasthan to be incorporated in Madhya Bharat because they know that Madhya Bharat itself is being abolished. On the contrary, in the Madhya Bharat Assembly, there were two amendments to the resolution which was moved by the Chief Minister to the effect that certain areas of Madhya Bharat should be given over to Rajasthan. I particularly

[Shri Kasliwal]

refer to the tehsils which are in Mandsaur District and to two or three teshils in Guna District. I will come to that later.

What the Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat said on the Bill is reported at page 91 of the proceedings of the Madhya Bharat Assembly. He said:

"बाउण्डरीज (सीमाओं) पर एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) की हैसियत से तब्दीली की आवश्यकता हैं उसके लिये गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को लेटर लिखा गया है । उस लेटर में वह तब्दीली सुझाई गई है वह मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूं लेकिन वह वैसी तो नहीं हैं जो यहां हाऊस में सुझाई गयी है । लेकिन उसमें कुछ बातें आ जाती है कुछ रिजन्स (क्षेत्र) बताये गये हैं उनसे अन्दाज, होगा । शाहगंज, किशनगंज दोनों तहसीलें मध्य भारत में आना चाहियें और पार्वती रिवर (नदी) के इस पार का हिस्सा सब इस तरफ आना चाहिये । इससे इतना होगा की मध्य भारत की बाऊंड्री १२८ मील है वह रिडयूस होकर १४८ मील रह जायेगी । इसके लिये लिखा गया है । वह मध्य प्रदेश में शामिल होगी । छबरा तहसील कोटा डिस्ट्रिक्ट की भी यही हालत हैं । अंधेरी नदी से इस तरफ का जो हिस्सा है सरहद ५६ मील है, ५६ मील की बाऊण्ड्री के बजाय १६ मील रह जाती है । इसी तरह डाका तिरावा तहसीलें हैं और एक १० मील का एरिया कोटा डिस्ट्रिक्ट का है उसकी गांधी सागर को जरूरत है । "

It is a most amazing statement. He seems to think that Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan are two foreign territories and the boundary line between Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan should be the rivers, that the Parvati river should be the dividing line so far as Kishenganj-Shahganj is concerned, and the Andheri river so far as Chabra is concerned. If he had dared to put this amendment in the Madhya Bharat Assembly itself, there would have been a lot of opposition and that is the reason why he did not do anything of that sort there. I think he is using undemocratic and stealthy methods, methods which are being used behind the back of not only the people of Rajasthan but the people of Madhya Bharat themselves, so that certain territories in an undemocratic manner may be acquired by the State of Madhya Bharat. I would like to warn the Home Minister against such a step and I may tell him that any step which is taken in this manner will be resisted not only by the people of Rajasthan but by the people of Madhya Bharat also. The Chief Minister of Madhya Bharat seems to be under the impression that it is within the authority of the Boundary Commission to give those areas to Madhya Bharat. But I find there is no provision for the appointment of a Boundary Commission in this Bill. It can never be the task of a Boundary Commission to hand over large areas of one State to another State. I want the Home Minister to make the position clear that it will not be the task of any Boundary Commission to do anything like that. At the most, the Boundary Commission can rectify certain small areas on the boundary line.

Now I come to another small matter and it is with regard to the claim of Rajasthan over certain areas of Madhya Bharat. I want to assure you that unless the people of Madhya Bharat themselves are agreeable, they will never be a part of the State of Rajasthan and the people or the State of Rajasthan will not demand any territory of Madhya Bharat. I know that in Mandsaur there is a great deal of agitation going on for joining with Rajasthan and I am told by certain friends that they are having signatures from thousands and thousands of people to see that Mandsaur District is joined with Rajasthan. But I am not making any claim here, because if the people of Mandsaur want to join Rajasthan, they will certainly do so. It is not my duty to say that they should join Rajasthan.

In the Madhya Bharat Assembly itself, two members moved an amendment to the resolution of the Chief Minister saying that certain areas of Madhya Bharat should be joined with Rajasthan, the areas of Bhanpura tehsil of Mandsaur District, and Raghogarh and Chachra in Guna District. It would be for the Joint Committee to say whether these areas should be joined with Rajasthan or not. I am only placing this point before the House.

There was another member who said that not merely these areas but certain areas adjacent to the areas of Chittor in Udaipur District should also be joined with Rajasthan. I will not go into this further. That is known as Kanera tehsil.

There is one other point that I would like to bring forward. When you go to Talwa in Ujjain, there is a small territory of Madhya Bharat getting into Rajasthan. At certain places that areas is less than 100 yards wide. There is

such a vast amount of blackmarketing and smuggling of opium going on in that portion that there are considerable administrative difficulties. I would request the hon. Home Minister to go into the question. I am making it very plain that I am not laying any claim to that area but I say that for administrative convenience it is absolutely essential that the area should be joined with Rajasthan. The area is very small and the population is hardly 4,000 or 5,000. To go to such places, you have to take the road which crosses into one side of Rajasthan, then again into the territory of Madhya Bharat, then again into the territory of Rajasthan and again into the territory of Madhya Bharat. It is a ridiculous state of affairs. I have got a big map of that territory which I will show to the hon. Home Minister and he will himself realise the desirability of that particular area being merged with Rajasthan.

An Hon. Member: What is the desire of the people there?

Shri Kasliwal: The desire of the people has never been found out, but they are for active connection with Rajasthan. I am quite sure that if they are consulted in this matter, they would say that they will prefer to be with Rajasthan.

I will take only one more minute and finish my speech. I have only to say something about Zonal Councils. I am very happy that we have now been put in the Northern Zone. The economic development of Rajasthan and the economic development of the Punjab are intertwined and I am glad that Rajasthan has been placed along with Punjab. We know that we have to get the water from Punjab and *bijli* from Punjab. That is why I am happy that we are together.

I do not want to say anything more except one little thing. In this House many hon. Members yesterday and today have made appeals for the unity of our country. I join all those Members who have spoken in that tone and I want to assure this House that so far as the people of Rajasthan are concerned, in any sacrifice that is demanded from them for the unity of the country, they will not be lagging behind. I want to say that in any step that is taken for the unity of India, the people of Rajasthan will stand shoulder to shoulder with the rest of the country.

श्रीमती मनिबेन पटेल (कैरा दक्षिण) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, इसके लिये मैं आप की आभारी हूं। आज मैं कई दिन से देख रही हूं, और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्यों, अभी तक गुजरात और सौराष्ट्र से किसी सदस्य को बोलने का मौका नहीं दिया गया। क्या यहां पर एक ही प्रकार का इम्प्रेशन (विचार) सब पर बना है, क्या सब एक ही प्रकार की राय रखते हैं और दूसरी आवाज निकलने की जरूरत नहीं है। आज दो दिनों से जो बहस यहां हो रही है उस को देख कर और सुन कर मुझे बड़ा दर्द होता है। जिस खूबी से हमने देश की ऐसी एकता बनाई थी जैसी कि पहले कभी नहीं थी, उस को देखते हुए आज ऐसा मालूम पड़ रहा है कि अब उसे मजबूत करने की अलावा, आज हम देश के टुकड़े करने की नींवें डाल रहे हो।

गुजरात प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी के लोगों ने तो कमिशन के सामने जा कर कहा था कि हम गुजरात के लोगों को समझा सकेंगे कि देश का खयाल करके बम्बई राज्य को, जैसा कि वह आज है, वैसा ही रहने देना ज्यादा अच्छा है। लेकिन जब कि कमीशन ने उस समय जो शक्ल उस की दी थी, उस को सही रूप में स्वीकार नहीं किया गया। एक बार उस मामले का फैसला करने के बाद, आज फिर उस पर लोगों को अपने विचार रखने का मौका मिल गया है और इसी लिये सारी गड़बड़ी आज तीन महीनों से चल रही है। आज हम को तो पूछा ही नहीं जाता है, आज कांग्रेस और सरकार यह समझती है, भरोसा है कि गुजरात के लोगों के लिये जो कुछ किया जायेगा उसको वे स्वीकार कर लेंगे। इस लिये आज हमारी कोई परवाह नहीं करता है। आज हम खत्म हो रहे हों तो भी उन को कोई परवाह नहीं है क्योंकि वह तो हम को राजी कर ही लेंगे किसी न किसी तरह से ऐसा भरोसा है। आज हम देश के लिये काम करें, देश का खयाल कर के हर बात पर राजी हो जायें, तो हमारी कोई नहीं सुनता है। परन्तु यदि कोई धमकी दे, कोई दंगा करे, त्याग पत्र दे, कोई रूस जाय, तो उस को राजी करने के लिये कोशिश हो रही है। लेकिन अब जब गुजरात राज्य बना कर दिया जा रहा है उस में भी ज्यादा कुछ नहीं दिया गया है। कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्ट दी थी उस में गुजरात राज्य बनाने की कोई बात नहीं थी। लेकिन जब आप गुजरात का एक अलग राज्य बना ही रहे हैं तो सही बात यह है कि आप पहले एक बाउंड्री कमीशन बनाइये।

[श्रीमती मनिबेन पटेल]

वह सारे हिस्से में घूमे और तब अपनी सिफारिश करे । यह नहीं कि यहां बैठे हुए, खाली एक नक्शा लेकर और सेन्सस (जनगणना) रिपोर्ट लेकर निर्णय कर लिया कि यह इधर जाना चाहिये और वह उधर जाना चाहिये । मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि क्या आप को स्थानीय लोगों का खयाल नहीं करना चाहिये और क्या आप उन के हित के विचार से ही सब कुछ कर रहे हैं । आप को उस जगह पर एक बाउंड्री कमिशन बना कर भेजना चाहिये जो कि पूरी तरह से जांच करे कि कौन सा हिस्सा किस तरफ जाना चाहिये और आपको उसकी रिपोर्ट दे । उस के बाद आपको अपना निर्णय लेना चाहिये । आज राजस्थान के लोगों ने दंगा किया, धमकी दी, लोगों से पैसा दे देकर वहां एक तूफान खड़ा किया, और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि आप उनको आबू दे रहे हैं । डांगजंगल के लिये हम कहते हैं कि जो हिस्सा नासिक की तरफ है महाराष्ट्र में जाय । परन्तु जो पहाड़ की इस बाजू है वहां बिना गुजरात में गये हुए कोई पहुंच नहीं सकता । अगर महाराष्ट्र कांग्रेस कमेटी डांग फारेस्ट में कोई मीटिंग करना चाहे तो उस को वलसाड़ और बिल्लीमोरा होकर ही जाना पड़ता है । फिर भी आप उस हिस्से को महाराष्ट्र में डालते हैं । मैं पूछती हूं कि क्या यह सब बातें आप ठीक कर रहे है । इसी तरह से आप ने नवापुर और उमरगांव का फैसला कर लिया । इस सब के बारे में मेरा इतना ही कहना है कि अगर आप इस तरह से एक हिस्सा दूसरे को और दूसरा हिस्सा तीसरे को देना चाहते हैं तो आप बिना जांच किये न कीजिये । आप एक बाउंड्री कमिशन बनाइये वह जो रिपोर्ट दे उस पर आप निर्णय कीजिये ।

इस के बाद मुझे यह कहना है कि जब आपने यह तय किया है कि महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात और बम्बई के अलग अलग राज्य बनें तो मुझे जिस सेलेक्ट कमेटी में यह बिल जा रहा है उस से यह विनती करनी है कि वह पहले सब जगहों के ऐसेट्स (आस्तियां) और लाइबिलिटीज (दायित्व) को देखे और उसके बाद ही कोई निर्णय करे । इस दफा बम्बई के फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने जो फिगर्स अपनी स्पीच में बताये हैं, मैं कुछ उनके बारे में भी कहना चाहती हूं । आप पहले उन को स्टेडी (अध्ययन) कीजिये और तब यह सोचिये कि किस तरह से सारी चीजों को बांटा जाना चाहिये । जैसा कि नागपुर प्लैन में कहा गया है रोड माइलेज का डेफिसिट अलग अलग जगहों में इस प्रकार है कि गुजरात में ८३ परसेन्ट रास्ते सड़कों की कमी है, महाराष्ट्र में ५४ परसेन्ट और कर्नाटक में ४७ परसेन्ट । उसी में बताया गया है कि सन् १९५३ में गुजरात की महसाना डिस्ट्रिक्ट में ९९ परसेन्ट की कमी थी, ९४.१ परसेन्ट साबारकांठा डिस्ट्रिक्ट में और ९०.५ परसेन्ट बनासकांठा डिस्ट्रिक्ट में सड़कों की कमी थी । जब आप देखते हैं कि वहां पर इतनी कमी है रोड माइलेज की है तो आपको इतनी थोड़ी सी चीजें बताकर यह कहना चाहते हैं कि गुजरात में काफी कमी है ? आज कुछ लोगों के दिल में आम तौर से यह खयाल है कि गुजरात काफी समृद्ध है, गुजरात की हालत ऐसी है कि उसको कोई मदद करने की जरूरत नहीं है । लेकिन यह आपके अन्दर बड़ी भारी गलतफहमी है । गुजरात का काफी बड़ा एरिया ऐसा है जो कि फुल्ली डेवेलप्ड (पूर्ण विकसित) नहीं है । आज अहमदाबाद को छोड़ कर पूना, शोलापुर, अमरावती जैसे शहर सारे गुजरात में नहीं हैं । यही सब सोच कर, जो हमारे बम्बई के फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर हैं उन्होंने ३ मार्च को जो बजट स्पीच दी है उसमें यह फिगर्स दिये हैं । उसके ऊपर सेलेक्ट कमेटी को पूरी तौर से गौर करने के बाद कोई निर्णय करना चाहिये ।

अब मैं बम्बई शहर पर आती हूं । मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि यह जो आप ने हवा बनाई है सारे देश में और इस हाउस में भी कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र का है यह कहां तक ठीक है ? यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है । बम्बई का इतिहास हमें दूसरी ही चीज बताता है । बम्बई असल में सात टापुओं का एक झुंड था जिन में नारियल के पेड़ थे । इसके बारे में जो कुछ इतिहास में लिखा है वह भी मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं । गैजेटियर आफ बाम्बे सिटी ऐंड आईलैंड, वाल्यूम २, पेज २ पर लिखा है :

> "The distribution of the various sections of the tribe points to Gujarat rather than to the southern country as their original home; in all likelihood they are descended from the pre-Aryan population of Gujarat, which gradually spread itself over the western littorel and absorbed the hunting and fishing cans of the stone age. Certain, however, it is that they formed rude-hut-settlements in each of these seven islets of Bombay and brought with them from Gujarat 'Mumbadevi', the patron goddess of Bombay, who under the title of 'Momai' is still worshipped as a village goddess in Kathiawad."

इसलिये जो यह हवा बनाई गई है कि बंबई महाराष्ट्र का है, यह बिल्कुल गलत ह । सन् १९०१ के सेन्सस आफ इंडिया के वाल्यूम ११ के पेज ३९ पर लिखा है :

'Some idea can be formed of the cosmopolitan character of our city and the Island by observing that 62 different laguages or dialects are spoken within its limits."

महाराष्ट्र का उसके साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था । मैं आपको बतलाना चाहती हूं कि उस समय महाराष्ट्र के व्यापारियों के लिए बम्बई आने के लिए इजाजत लेनी पड़ती थी ।

इसके बाद यह लिखा है :

Statistical Account of the Town and Island of Bombay, 1896, Vol. I, page 351 :

"At a consultation, the 31st May 1763, Government remark :

"As the Moghul, *i.e.* the Nizam's army has entirely destroyed Poona, many of the principal traders have asked and received permission to repair hither with their families....' This measure was approved by the Court who writes (22nd March 1765) :

'we approve the measure you took in inviting the inhabitants of Poona to settle at Bombay' ".

१६६१ में बंबई में केवल १०,००० आदमियों की बस्ती थी । उसमें ११ पुर्तगाली कुटुम्ब थे । बाकी सब कोली थे । ये लोग काठियावाड़ से तथा गुजरात से आये थे । यह मैंने अभी आपको बता दिया है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करती हूं कि आप मुझे पांच मिनट बोलने के लिए और दें । पिछले दो दिनों से एक ही प्रकार के प्वाइंट आफ व्यू (दृष्टिकोण) इस भवन में रखे गए हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : और भी माननीय सदस्य जो इस इलाके के हैं, वे भी बोलेंगे ।

श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल : कम से कम पांच मिनट तो दीजिये ।

इसके बाद एडवर्ड ने बाम्बे टाइम्स में १८४८ से जो कुछ उसमें दिया हैं वह मैं आपको पढ़कर सुनाती हूं ।

"Our shopkeepers are nearly all Parsis—so are our furniture makers also—but the workmen employed in the manufacture of Bombay furniture of such exquisite design, and, beyond mere carving of such indifferent workmanship, are nearly all men from Kutch and Gujarat. Our best shoe-makers are Chinaman; our stone-cutter are all from the interior. Our armourers, our perfume dealers are mostly Persians; our horse dealers are Afgans and Baluchis. Our potters form a regular organised craft and pay homage to a deity presiding over them, just as our crafts at home had their organisation and patron saints in the days of yore...."

फिर सैंसस आफ इंडिया वाल्यूम १० पेज ४ पर लिखा हुआ है :

"The increase of population, recorded in 1882, was partially assured by the continued improvement of communications. The Great Indian Peninsula and the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railways threw out fresh lines, linked themselves with other and more remote rail-roads, until the island became the central terminus of a series of arterial railways, radiating in various directions across the continent of India. Communication by sea became yet more regular; its advantages acquired more celebrity among the dwellers in the coast-hamlets; news of the city, and of the means of livelihood which it afforded, was thereby spread further afield."

अब १८६१ में बम्बई में १९,६,००० स्पिडल्स थीं और २,७०० लम्स चलती थी । १८७५ में इनकी तादाद ८,७०,००० और ७,८०० हो गई ।

काटन की मिलें १८७२ में १२ थीं जो कि बढ़कर १८७९ म ३० हो गईं । इन सब चीजों को बताने का मेरा मतलब यह है कि इन लोगों का जो यह क्लेम है कि बम्बई हमारा है, यह बिल्कुल गलत है । इतने दिनों तक तो महाराष्ट्रवासियों के लिए वहां कोई जगह नहीं थी और गुजरात तथा कच्छ से और सौराष्ट्र से लोक वहां पर आकर

[श्रीमती मनिबेन पटेल]

बसे । लेकिन जब भोरघाट काटा गया, जब रेल बनी, उसके बाद ही इन लोगों को वहां आना मिला ।

आखिर में मुझे यह कहना है कि आज जिन लोगों के हाथ में देश की बागडोर है, और जिनमें से इस वक्त कोई भी इस भवन में उपस्थित नहीं है और मैं चाहती हूं कि मेरी यह राय उन तक पहुंचा दी जाये, उनको चाहिये कि वे देश की एकता को मजबूत करें, हमारे देश को संगठित करें, अच्छा वातावरण पैदा करने की कोशिश करें । अगर इस देश के टुकड़े-टुकड़े हुए तो मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि इसकी जिम्मेवारी आपके ऊपर होगी । मैं चाहती हूं कि जिन्होंने देश को आजाद करवाया उनको यह भी देखना है कि हमारा देश मजबूत नींव पर खड़ा हो ।

एक बात का मुझे दुख है और वह यह है कि आज जो टेकटिक्स (चालें) खेले जा रहे हैं, जिस तरह से धमकियां दी जा रही हैं, जिस तरह से गड़बड़ी फैलाने की कोशिश की जा रही है, जिस तरह से त्यागपत्र देने की बात कही जा रही है, यह सब कुछ ठीक नहीं है । अब जब उनकी किसी भी मांग को नहीं माना जाता है तो वे इतना ही कह देते हैं कि अगर और कुछ नहीं तो इतना ही कह दो कि बम्बई तुम्हारा है । इस बात को कहने के बाद वे कहेंगे कि अब तो बम्बई हमें इसे देना चाहिए । जो बात सही नहीं है वह ये लोग आपसे करवाना चाहते हैं । मैं उनकी इस मांग को सही नहीं मानती और मैं नहीं चाहती कि बम्बई उनको दिया जाये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Lala Achint Ram.

Several Hon. Members: *rose—*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When I look one way, the Members do not show their eagerness in standing. How can I judge whether any Member is prepared to speak or not. I would request the hon. Members at least to give some indication to me, not by the chits they have sent to me, but by at least standing up in their seats.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): I have given my chit.

Shri Gidwani: We are under the impression that we would be called because we have sent our chits.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was looking to my left, now I will come to the other side also.

Shri C. Bhatt (Broach): We have been trying to draw the attention of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I realise the point of the hon. Member, but he is not the only Member who has got this complaint.

Shri C. Bhatt: You were pleased to say, Sir, that we are not getting up in our seats. We have been getting up for the last two days....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When I looked up, even the hon. Member, who is complaining now, was not on his legs. I did look this side. I do not say whether I would have really called him, but I did look this way.

Shri Bansilal (Jaipur): Sir, I want to make a small suggestion. This subject has been discussed for a long time. My suggestion is that those Members who have already expressed their views on the subject should not again be given a chance. They are again speaking. I think that is not fair. Those Members who did not get any opportunity to speak in spite of their best efforts, should be given an opportunity now.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Those who are members of the Joint Committee should not be allowed to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Bansilal, and I will request hon. Members, who have already participated in the debate on this subject, not to try to catch my eye now. Moreover, I will request hon. Members from Uttar Pradesh that they should also not try to catch my eye. Many of them seem to be anxious to speak. Members from those States that have not been affected should give chance to others whose States are really affected. There are a large number of Members from U. P. If they also stand by and allow others to speak, perhaps it will be better and we may be able to accommodate more Members.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: My suggestion is this.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are we to continue this discussion? No further suggestions are required now. We may hear the hon. Member, Lala Achint Ram.

Shri Jwala Prashad (Ajmer North): He has spoken last time also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have committed a mistake. Now that I have called him, let us hear him.

Lala Achint Ram (Hissar): I can drop out, if you like, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may go on. But, now that a complaint has been made, he must be brief.

लाला अचित राम : आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष जी मैं आपको बहुत धन्यवाद देता हूं कि इतने मतालवात के बावजूद अपने मुझे बोलने का मौक दे दिया ।

मैं इस मोशन (प्रस्ताव) की ताईद करता हूं और साथ ही जिस मुस्तकिल मिजाजी से गवर्नमेंट ने एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट को आगे बढ़ाया है, बावजूद रेसपांसिबिल क्वार्टर्स (जिम्मेवार) व्यक्तियों) द्वारा यह कहे जाने के कि इससे देश में दंगे फिसाद फैल जायंगे, उसके लिए गवर्नमेंट को मुबारकबाद देता हूं । इसके अलावा मुल्क की स्टेबिलिटी (स्थायित्व) को मजबूत बनाने के लिए बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर (मुख्य मंत्री) साहब और सिन्हा साहब ने जो कदम उठाया उसके लिए मैं उनकी तारीफ करता हूं । उन्होंने उस वक्त मुल्क की मदद की जब कि लोगों को यह ख्याल था कि बंगाल और बिहार अपने मसले को हल नहीं कर पायेंगे। उन्होंने उस वक्त अपने मसले का फैसला ही नहीं किया बल्कि वे उससे भी बहुत आगे चले गये । मुल्क की बुनियाद को मजबूत करने में उन्होंने जो हिस्सा लिया है मैं समझता हूं उसके लिए हिस्ट्री (इतिहास) में उनका नाम रहेगा ।

एस० आर० सी रिपोर्ट के मुताल्लिक बहुत सारे झगड़े थे, लेकिन उनमें पंजाब और बम्बई का झगड़ा सबसे आगे रहा है और उस तरफ मुल्क की तवज्जह लगी रही है । जहां तक बम्बई का ताल्लुक है मुझे बड़ी खुशी है बहुत सा मसला हल हो गया है और थोड़ा सा हल होना बाकी है । पहले मैं समझता था कि बम्बई में झगड़े इस वास्ते आये कि लोगों के दिल में गुस्सा आ गया था । लेकिन पिछले दो तीन महीनों के हालात देखने के बाद मैं समझता हूं कि वे झगड़े रोके जा सकते थे । मालूम पड़ता है कि इस मामले में हाई कमांड को अच्छा मशविरा नहीं मिला । मैं समझता हूं कि अब आगे कोई झगड़ा नहीं होगा और बम्बई का सारा मामला हल हो जायेगा । और बम्बई महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जायेगा ।

अब मैं पंजाब के मुताल्लिक अर्ज करना चाहता हूं । दर हकीकत पंजाब का जो मसला था वह बम्बई के मसले से भी बड़ा था । आप पूछेंगे क्यों ? उसकी वजह यह है कि हम अपने मुल्क में और दूसरे मुल्कों में बड़ी बड़ी बातें करते हैं, पंचशील की और सुलह की बात करते थे । लेकिन हम अपने मुल्क के सिख माईनौरेटी (अल्प संख्यकों) मसले को शान्ति से हल नहीं कर पा रहे थे, इससे हमारे सिर शर्म से नीचे होते थे । इसलिए पंजाब का मसला इम्पार्टेंट (महत्वपूर्ण) था । खुशी की बात है कि पंजाब के अकाली मसले को गवर्नमेंट ने अपने हाथ में लिया और उसको हल करने की कोशिश की । इस वक्त में वहां के मुताल्लिक एक बात अर्ज करना चाहता हूं ताकि वहां का नक्शा आपकी समझ में ठीक तरह से आ सके । हमारे होम मिनिस्टर (गृह-मंत्री) साहब ने एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट निकलने से पहले मुल्क में अपीलें निकालीं और कहा कि इस रिपोर्ट को आम तौर पर स्वीकार किया जाये । उस वक्त मुल्क के हालात बहुत नाजुक थे । पन्त जी ने बार बार अपीलें इसलिए कीं कि उनका असर अच्छा हो लेकिन पंजाब के अन्दर उनका जो असर हुआ उसका आप अन्दाजा लगा सकेंगे । पंजाब में डेढ़ करोड़ आबादी है जिसमें एक करोड़ हिन्दू हैं और ५० लाख के करीब सिख हैं । एक करोड़ हिन्दू को दो हिस्सों में बंटे हुए हैं, एक हिस्सा हिन्दी बोलने वाला है, दूसरा पंजाबी वाला । इस नक्शे को आप समझ लें । पन्त जी की अपील का यह नतीजा निकला कि जब एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट आयी तो जालन्धर के ५० लाख हिन्दुओं ने कहा कि हम इसको कबूल करते हैं और जो हरियाना के हिन्दू थे उन्होंने कहा कि हमें यह कबूल नहीं है । सिखों ने कहा कि हमें यह कबूल नहीं है । कांग्रेस वालों ने कहा कि हमें रिपोर्ट मंजूर है । अब सवाल यह था कि पचास लाख हिन्दू और पचास लाख सिख जो उसको कबूल नहीं करते उनके लिए क्या किया जाये । अभी तक अकालियों के खिलाफ जो प्रापोगेंडा हुआ था कि ये कम्युनिस्ट (सम्प्रदायवादी) हैं, मास्टर तारा सिंह अलग सिख राज्य कायम करना चाहते हैं, वगैरह वगैरह, उसकी परवाह न करके गवर्नमेंट ने उनको बुलाया और कहा कि हम तुम से बात करेंगे। इससे मुझे बहुत खुशी हुई । उनसे बात करने के बाद एक हल निकाला गया । आप देखें कि जब एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट आयी तो लोगों पर क्या असर हुआ, जब गवर्नमेंट ने उसमें कुछ तबदीली करने की कोशिश की तब क्या असर हुआ और जब गवर्नमेंट ने सिखों से बात करके

[लाला अचित राम]

हल निकाला तो उसका क्या असर हुआ । जब गवर्नमेंट ने आखिरी हल निकाला तो जिन लोगों ने पहले कहा था कि अच्छा किया उन्होंने यह कहना शुरू कर दिया कि यह गलत किया । कांग्रेस वालों ने हर बात यही कहा कि ठीक किया । जब गवर्नमेंट ने आखिरी फार्मूला निकाला तो जो पहले गवर्नमेंट के पक्ष में थे वे खिलाफ हो गये और जो गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ थे वे माफिक हो गये । सिख सरकार के माफिक हो गये । पहले जिनको कम्युनलिस्ट कहा जाता था, जिनके बारे में कहा जाता था कि ज्ञानी करतार सिंह पाकिस्तान से मिल गये हैं वे गवर्नमेंट के मफिक हो गये । लेकिन जो जालन्धर के हिन्दू थे उनके लिए अब यह कहा जाने लगा कि ये कम्युनलिस्ट हैं और जनसंघी हैं । तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि ईश्वर के लिए उनको इस तरह से कंडेम (निंदित) न कीजिये । कल वह आपके पक्ष में थे । मेरे दिल में सरदार हुकुम सिंह साहब के लिए बड़ी इज्जत है उस वक्त से जब से कि वह मांटगोमरी में वकालत करते थे । उन्होंने कहा कि वह जो अब मुखालफत करते हैं इस वास्ते करते हैं क्योंकि अकाली इस स्कीम की हिमायत करते हैं, लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि क्या उन्होने एस० आर० सी० की तजवीज की इस वास्ते हिमायत की थी क्योंकि उन्होंने उसकी मुखालफत की थी ? पहले अकाली रिपोर्ट के खिलाफ थे लेकिन अब उन्होंने उसको कबूल कर लिया है और दूसरे लोग खिलाफ हैं । तो इसको कबूल करने या न करने की वजह से किसी को कम्युनलिस्ट नहीं कहा जा सकता, और यदि थोड़ी बहुत गलती हो तो कहने से कुछ फायदा नहीं है न एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट ही कम्युनल हो सकती है क्योंकि इसको मुल्क के बैस्ट (सर्वोत्तम) तीन आदमियों ने बनाया है । लेकिन अगर नई स्कीम की कोई कबूल नहीं करता तो उसे कम्युनलिस्ट नहीं कहना चाहिए और कंडेम नहीं करना चाहिये । पहले सिख लोग इसको स्वीकार नहीं करते थे । पन्त जी ने सिखों को बुलाया और उनसे बात की । उस वक्त कहा जाता था कि सिख अपना अलग राज्य चाहते हैं । मैं तो कहता हूं कि अगर सरदार हुकुम सिंह और मास्टर तारा सिंह का राज्य हो तो मुझे मंजूर है । जहां तक कांग्रेस वालों का सवाल है उन्होंने हर बात को कबूल किया । जब रिपोर्ट आयी तो उसे कबूल किया, उसमें तब्दीली की गयी तो उसे कबूल किया और फिर जब यह फार्मूला निकला तो उसे भी कबूल किया क्योंकि वे समझते थे कि जो उनके नेता हैं वे देश का भला चाहते हैं और जो वे करते हैं वह देश के भले के लिए करते हैं ।

प्रतिरक्षा संगठन मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) : ऐसा कांग्रेस में कभी नहीं हुआ । कांग्रेसी हमेशा आजादी से अपनी बात कहते हैं ।

लाला अचित राम : आप उस असर को देखें जो कि इस रिपोर्ट के तीनों फेजेज में उन पर हुआ । तो अब यह फार्मूला है । मैं समझता हूं कि इसको टैस्ट (अजमा) करके देखा जाये कि यह डिमाक्रेटिक (प्रजातंत्री) कहां तक है । मैं पूछता हूं कि अगर पंजाब की असेम्बली में मेजारिटी (बहुमत) किसी रीजन की बात के खिलाफ हो तो उसको वह क्या रद्द नहीं कर सकती ? वह आप की डेमाक्रेसी कहां गयी ? एक जोन के अन्दर एक गिनती कम थी, उनको मेजारिटी में लाया गया, मैं पूछता हूं कहां गई आपकी सेकुलरिज्म (निरपेक्षता) ? वैसे मैं साफ कर दूं कि मुझे डेमाक्रेसी या सेकुलरिज्म की ज्यादा पर्वाह नहीं—मुझे उसकी रिपोर्ट की जरूरत है बल्कि नेताओं को असल पर्वाह इस बात की थी कि कैसे इस गुत्थी को सुलझाया जाय और मुझे यह देखकर बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने अकालियों के दिल को जीत लिया है, रही डेमोक्रेसी की बात, उसकी मुझे पर्वा नहीं है और न ही सेकुलरिज्म की मुझे पर्वाह है यदि उनकी स्पिरिट कायम रहे यह बहुत इतमीनान की बात है कि पंजाब की समस्या का हल गवर्नमेंट ने बहुत ही खूबसूरती के साथ कर लिया है और उससे पंजाब का वातावरण बहुत अच्छा बन गया है और जो डिटेल्स (ब्यौर) को लेकर थोड़ा बहुत मतभेद अगर रह भी गया है तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अगर पंत जी और सरदार हुक्म सिंह आपस में मिल कर उसको हल करने की कोशिश करें तो वे जरूर उसको हल कर लेंगे और मुझे इसके बारे में कोई शक नहीं है । जहां हमने ३३ परसेंट (प्रतिशत) को ६६ परसेंट किया है, मैं समझता हूं कि सेंट परसेंट (शत-प्रतिशत) भी हो सकता है ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मैं सोचता हूं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश, कांगड़ा और काश्मीर के पहाड़ी इलाकों का एक अलग जोन बनाना चाहिए । मैं नहीं समझता कि जब बख्शी साहब और परमार साहब आपस में मिलने को तैयार हैं तो क्या वजह है कि आप उनका एक पहाड़ी प्रदेश क्यों नहीं बना देते, इसी में देश का भला है और डेमाक्रेसी का भला है । अगर आप इन पहाड़ी प्रदेशों को मिला

कर इनका एक अलग प्रदेश नहीं बनाना चाहते तो कम से कम यह तो कर दीजिये कि पंजाब और हिमाचल प्रदेश का एक गवर्नर होगा और दोनों के लिए एक पबलिक सर्विस कमीशन (लोक सेवा आयोग) होगा और उनका एक हाईकोर्ट होगा, इतना तो कीजिये और रीजनेल स्कीम के रूल्स को एहतीयात से बनाया जाए ।

Shri C. R. Chowdary (Narasaraopet): I have been listening to the observations made in favour as well as against the claims of Maharashtrians on the city of Bombay. I have been closely following the various arguments and I have come to the definite conclusion that the city of Bombay rightly belongs to Maharashtrians. Neither the Gujaratis nor anybody else has got even a moral claim to say that Bombay should remain as a separate State.

Kuamri Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): On a point of order, Sir. I find that so much preference is given to Maharashtrians that the Kerala State is lost in the gloom.

An Hon. Member: Is it a point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She wanted to be heard and that has been done.

Kuamri Annie Mascarene : No ruling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may proceed with his speech.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: As reported in the Press, the step taken by the Finance Minister as a Maharashtrian, coming from that part of the country to which the Bombay city rightly belongs, is a correct step in the right direction and for a good cause. He will have all the sympathy of all the right-thinking people on this issue. By making a reference to his reported resignation, it is not my intent to create differences between the Members of the Cabinet. I agree with the statement reported sometime back in the Press that if Bombay is to be separated from Maharashtra, there is the danger of that city going into the hands of goondas. I endorse that view and I endorse what was said by Mr. Khardekar yesterday. In order to avert the situation in which the fine Bombay city would be taken away from the Maharashtrians and come under the regime of goondas, Bombay should be given to the Maharashtrians. The only course to avert that crisis is to give away Bombay city to Maharashtrians who have got a moral and legal claim to it.

Speaking on Andhra State Bill in the year 1953 from this side of the House, I was saying that the Andhras would not rest content unless and until they got Visalandhra. At that time we were under the impression that it would take about 3 years roughly from the 1st October, 1953 to get Visalandhra for Andhras. We expected that desire would be fulfilled when we heard about the appointment of a Commission for the purpose of reporting on the reorganisation of States suitably. But, we did not find a complete recommendation for the formation of Visalandhra; the recommendation was against it and the issue was deferred for a period of five years. But fortunately for us, the high-power committee appointed to consider the S. R. C. Report decided the issue in favour of the formation of Visalandhra. But, the decision taken by the high-power committee has not touched another issue that has been left untouched by the S. R. C. I am referring to those parts which are contiguous to the new State of Andhra, where the Andhras are in majority. That issue has not been touched and no decision has been taken. This has highly disappointed the Andhras. So long as the Andhras who are in a linguistic majority living in areas contiguous to the new State of Andhra are kept separate, it is bound to be a source of trouble from both the quarters. Therefore, it must receive immediate attention and favourable consideration.

Take for instance the Mysore State. In Kolar District, excepting the three taluks of Kolar, Bangarupet and Malur, the Telugu-speaking population is more than 50 per cent. and the area is contiguous to the new Andhra State which is going to be constituted. Therefore, the Telugu-speaking people who are in a majority in the Kolar District, if they are left in Mysore, they will become a minority community and lose all their rights. It would be an anomalous position. Likewise, the people speaking Telugu are in absolute majority in Pavagada in Tumkur District. There has been constant and continuous agitation in the area in Orissa which we call Parlakimidi for its transfer to Andhra, because it is admitted that Parlakimidi is a predominantly Telugu area. But, by the fraud of the then ruling prince, and the Sovereign authority, it was placed in the Province of Orissa, which is now the

[Shri C. R. Chowdary]

State of Orissa. Nobody has paid any attention to this agitation though it has been there for quite a long time. Nor has even the present party in power paid any heed to the agitation of the people that has been there for as long as 40 years.

3 P.M.

It is not as if Telugus are being left only in Orissa and Mysore. They are also left in the areas which are to be constituted as the Maharashtra State. Areas which were rightly called Telengana are no more to be part of Telengana. They will be left over to Mysore, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. Take, for instance, the Raichur district which can rightly be called a Telugu area. Out of a population of 160,000, 66,000 are Telugus, 54,000 are Kannadigas, 27,000 are Hindi-speaking people and 17,000 are Marathi-speaking people. This district has not been transferred to Andhra, but it is being left in some other State. Some firkas in Yadagiri taluk are predominantly Telugu-speaking areas and they must be in the Andhra State. Out of a population of 83,000 in Siram taluk, 36,000 speak Telugu. What is the justification for keeping it in another State; where the rest of the population speaks other languages. Mudhol in Nanded district which is contiguous to the Andhra State to be constituted, is a Telugu area and it is being kept in Maharashtra. In Siravanch taluk, out of a population of 94,000, 48,000 are Telugus.

Apart from this population factor, there is another important factor for consideration. The Andhras are now desirous of having, at a future date a multi-purpose project on the River Godavari with a view to develop the hinterland that lies between the rivers Krishna and the Godavari. Not only that. Unless that project is taken up and constructed, it will not be possible for the Andhras to give water to Tamilnad. The waters of Godavari can be taken further only if that project at Inchampalli is completed. Therefore, apart from the need of that particular area the needs of the Tamilians are also there. This project is very important to us. A provision including these areas I have mentioned, may be made in the Bill as an addition in and to clause 3.

It is also important to point out that in the Bill, there is no provision for the appointment of a boundary commission, to make the necessary adjustments, which we had previously. It is incumbent and necessary to make this provision. The hon. Home Minister, in his reply, may draw my attention to the provisions in Part III of the Bill, relating to zonal councils. I ask, how the boundary adjustments could be effected, under these provisions, as between Andhra and Orissa? There will be a zonal council for the States in the Dakshina Pradesh, in which there is not, the State of Orissa. Therefore, under the present provisions, it is not possible to settle any boundary disputes adjustment between Orissa and Andhra there. Likewise between Maharashtra and Andhra; likewise between Madhya Pradesh and Andhra. So it is necessary to make a provision for the appointment of a boundary commission to go into all these matters and make recommendations. I submit that the Joint Committee may consider this important issue and make a suitable provision to enable the appointment of a boundary Commission in future after this Bill is passed into an Act.

Then, Sir,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. No new point can be taken up. He must finish his speech.

Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very grateful to you for giving me a few minutes to participate in this debate.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ten, there are.

Shri C. C. Shah: The proposals for territorial reorganisation which are embodied in this Bill have been arrived at and placed before the House after great deliberation. They are not proposals which are hastily made. Nor are they proposals which have been made without full consideration of every relevant factor. In fact, before placing those proposals before the House, Government took the unusual, but the very wise step of having a full debate on the S.R.C. Report. During those nine days of what we may call a Marathon debate, every point of view was fully represented. It is not only during that discussion that every point of view was represented fully. This is what the States Reorganisation Commission itself says:

> "The case for and against the integration of the city in Samyukta Maharashtra was presented to us by the contending parties very ably and in great detail."

My submission is that the proposals, embodied in this Bill represent, in a very disputable matter, the greatest common measure of agreement between the contending parties. That common measure of agreement has been arrived at after months of discussion, innumerable deliberations. Times out of number the High Command went out of its way to change its decision, even at the risk of appearing vacillating and weak in order to accommodate views which they thought they must try to accommodate as much as they possibly can. As late as February this year, the Amritsar session of the Congress unanimously endorsed the decisions which are now before this hon. House. I respectfully submit, in spite of the heat generated in this House, that not a single new argument has been advanced, not a single new factor has come forward which can make us change that decision. It may be that people have changed their views here and there for reasons which we need not probe into. In spite of the geo-politics of my hon. friend Shri Feroze Gandhi—I am sorry he is not here—his idea of hinterland seems to stop where the borders of Gujarat begin. His vision is very limited. That is all I can tell him. But, I say, this hinterland business is not a new thing. If you read the S.R.C. Report, it will be seen that they themselves have referred to it. Geography, history, culture and what not, every single factor which could be brought to bear upon this question has been brought out. After considering all these things, Government has come to this decision.

What is the new thing that has happened after that? Riots in Bombay; intimidation, threats of non-co-operation threats of resignation. Is that a factor which will make us change our decision? It is said, look at the intensity of our feeling. I do recognise the intensity of feeling. But will you also look at the intensity of feeling of others, or will you only consider the intensity of feeling of yourselves and none else? This is a matter which was very difficult of solution. This is a matter which exercised the ingenuity and mind of the best of people in this country. Commission after commission, people who were most disinterested, who were impartial, and who had nothing whatever to do with this issue have come to two conclusions, firstly that the best solution for the city of Bombay is to have a bilingual State, and secondly that Bombay cannot be part of a unilingual State. These are the two unanimous conclusions of every committee, of every commission, of the Government, of the Congress, and of everybody else.

The JVP Committee had said that to make Bombay part of a unilingual State would mean its rapid deterioration; it will mean loss not only to Bombay, but it will be a national loss, it will be a national calamity. It is not that I am speaking for Gujarat only I am speaking for the whole country when I say that to make Bombay part of a unilingual State will be a national calamity.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is what you think.

Shri C. C. Shah: These two conclusions were arrived at by every commission.

An Hon. Member: That is only his opinion.

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): How will it be a national calamity? Let the hon. Member please explain it.

Shri C. C. Shah: I have got only ten minute's time, and therefore I do not like these interruptions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members shall have to hear him patiently. It is the hon. Member's opinion that we have to hear now.

Shri C. C. Shah: This best solution which the SRC recommended is rejected by Maharashtrians. By rejecting the best solution which S.R.C. recommended, can compel us to accept the worst solution?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member addresses me, perhaps he would be safe.

Shri C. C. Shah: I am sorry. By rejecting the best solution which the SRC recommended, can Maharashtrians compel us to accept the worst solution, the worst solution being that Bombay should become part of a unilingual State? Now, what have our Government done? They have found a *via media*, and that *via media* is to preserve

[Shri C. C. Shah]

Bombay as a union territory for the benefit of all, and not to put it in either the one State or the other.

Now, people go on saying, "We want justice to be done". I say, should justice be taken to mean that 'Until you concede hundred per cent. or sixteen annas in a rupee of what we consider to be justice, no justice is done to us'? I respectfully submit, that in that manner, appeasement will never satisfy anybody.

Let us take their demands and see how they have been conceded. Every time they have made any demand, to the utmost extent, efforts are made to concede it. Do they still say, 'We will accept any decision which the High Command gives in this matter? Are they prepared to accept and declare unequivocally here and show that 'Whatever may be the decision, whether favourable to us or unfavourable to us, we shall accept it, we shall faithfully abide by it and carry it out'?

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): After all, it is the High Command which will decide.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let these things not be decided in this way, because the hon. Member has got only a limited time.

Shri C. C. Shah: Now, what have you done? Every now and then, Shri Shankar Rao Deo says, 'I shall accept the arbitration of the Prime Minister on everything except on the issue of Bombay; I do not trust him there'. Now, appeals are made to the Prime Minister to do them justice. Is it not the Prime Minister who has come to this conclusion? Is it not the Prime Minister who has said in the JVP report that it would mean the rapid deterioration of the city of Bombay if it were made part of a unilingual area? Was it not the Prime Minister who in the JVP report gave an unequivocal pledge to the people of the country that under no circumstances—if Bombay State is distintegrated—would Bombay become part of a unilingual area? That is the pledge which the Prime Minister gave, and that is the pledge which the president of the Congress gave. That was the pledge which the Deputy Prime Minister of India gave. And that is the pledge on which the country has acted.

You talk of the intensity of feeling. Gujarat has been associated with Bombay for centuries, as long as, as intensely as, and as intimately as Maharashtra has been associated with it. There is not a single village, or a single town in Saurashtra, Gujarat or Kutch, whose economy does not depend on the prosperity of Bombay. Every village and town in Gujarat depends on the city of Bombay. Ask my friend Shri Bhawanji whether there is a single village in Kutch which does not depend on Bombay. Speaking for Saurashtra, I can say that there is not a single village which does not depend on Bombay. Similarly, undoubtedly, Maharashtra also depends on Bombay; the people of Maharashtra depend upon Bombay. So, both of us are intimately connected with the city of Bombay. All that Government have done is that they say: 'We shall preserve it for the benefit of all. It is talked as if to separate Bombay from Maharashtra is to separate the head from the body. It is equally so in the case of Gujarat. Bombay has been the head for Gujarat as well. If you talk that way that it is like separating the head from the body in the case of Maharashtra then I say that it is equally so in the case of Gujarat as well.

People seem to think as if when Bombay becomes a union territory, a sort of Chinese wall will be erected around Bombay, where none can come, as if the people from Kolaba and Ratnagiri will be driven out of Bombay, as if the people of Ratnagiri and Kolaba are the people who are going to suffer. I say that Bombay is being preserved for the benefit of all, in order that it may not exclusively go to one party, to the disadvantage of the other. It is inherent in a linguistic State that a dominant linguistic group seeks to gain economic advantages for itself by using all political means at its power. That is the very formative principle of a linguistic State. None can blame them for that. Linguistic States are formed on that basis. And everyone who does not belong to that linguistic group is an outsider, and therefore he is treated with a sort of inferior citizenship. That is why Government do not want that so far as Bombay is concerned, those who have lived in Bombay for centuries should suffer.

There was only one man in Maharashtra who told the truth, and that was Appa Sahib Patwardhan. He said, what is wrong with this decision of the Government of India? Two sons quarrel between themselves about a joint property which they have built up as a result of the efforts of centuries; so, the father says, all right, if you cannot come to an agreement between yourselves, then I shall keep the property for the benefit of all, until such time as you come to an agreement. Are the Union Government going to discriminate against the Maharashtrians? Are the Union Government going to say that the Maharashtrians will not get the benefits out of their connection with Bombay? Have the Ministers of the Centre even gone to the length of saying that 'My constituency will suffer, therefore, I resign? What is it that we have come to?

I respectfully submit in all humility that this is the correct decision, the only correct decision which can be made in the circumstances. Undoubtedly, it is the right decision.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav (Ambad): 'Crack' or 'correct' decision?

Shri C. C. Shah: I say that that is the correct decision. For having uttered this truth in Maharashtra what has happened to Appa Sahib Patwardhan? His *ashram* was burnt.. In Maharashtra, none dare to tell the truth today. But sitting here when the future historian of India comes to write about us, about the reorganisation of the States, and about this decision in regard to the city of Bombay, shall it be said of us by him that only one city in India, which is the mirror of the life of India, where every man feels, 'This is my home', and where none feels himself to be an outsider, a city of which we can be proud, a city which is our international window to the world, has been preserved for posterity, that even in this linguistic fury, in this linguistic madness which had seized us, we have retained at least one spot where every man in India will say. This is my home, this is India'?

It is not only for Gujarat that I plead. It is for the nation that I plead that Bombay is the pride of the nation, and Bombay shall remain the pride of the nation.

Shri C. Bhatt: Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir,. . . . .

Shri Jwala Prashad: The Speaker had stated that those Members who had spoken last time may not stand now. Shri C. C. Shah had spoken last time also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri C. C. Shah did speak on the last occasion. I had noted that, but I should like to tell the hon. Member that the members of Gujarat had decided and they had sent a chit to me to that effect, that he should be called. Therefore, I could not help it.

Shri Jwala Prashad: Ajmer is going to lose its separate identity now, and it is going to be merged. So, I would request that I may also be given a chance to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should resume his seat now. I have called upon Shri C. Bhatt.

Shri C. Bhatt: I was amused to hear the speeches made here for the last two days on the floor of this House. Speaker after speaker had pleaded that Bombay should be included in Maharashtra. I do not know what has happened so as to change their minds suddenly. They are coming and saying that they are helping the Government in solving the problem. But what do we find? Are they really coming and helping the Government. . . .

Shri Velayudhan: Address your own group.

Shri C. Bhatt: I welcome this Bill. I shall give my reasons for doing so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member enters into these controversies, he would be losing his own time.

Shri C. Bhatt: I rise to support the State Reorganisation Bill that is before us. Speaker after speaker from the Opposition has spoken for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. I can understand it, because for the very existence of their parties, they have to speak that way.

On this side when I was hearing Swami Shri Ramananda Tirtha, I was amazed and astonished. He says: 'I am open to correction. I am open to conviction'. Well, judgment after judgment

[Shri C. Bhatt]

verdict after verdict, has gone against Maharashtra's case for Bombay. The Dar Commission had reported that Bombay should not be included in Maharashtra. The JVP Report also was against Bombay's inclusion in Maharashtra. Then the Working Committee's decision was there. Later there was the SRC Report. Now, what more does he want for his conviction and correction?

But I know there are people who always speak something and then they back out. So many things have happened in Bombay. There were riotings; there were molestations of women. We are all here. We say that 'Let us forget it'. My hon. friend, Dr. Suresh Chandra, said yesterday, 'Done is done'. Well, I put it to the House: if our own children and our own sisters had been treated like this, what would we have done? If the honour and self-respect of our women had been violated this way, what would we have done? These are the things that have happened. And these things have happened even before Bombay became a part of Maharashtra. Can you imagine what will happen when it goes to Maharashtra?

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): May I ask, with your permission, as to how these things are relevant?

Shri C. Bhatt: The Maharashtrians are very clever people. They think that the prestige of Maharashtra is at stake. They have put up Shri Shankarrao Deo as their spokesman. Now, Shri Shankarrao Deo has a very dubious behaviour. He was in the Congress. Then he went to constructive work.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should the hon. Member describe him in that manner?

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: Can the hon. Member speak in that manner (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member should also avoid references to particular individuals.

Shri C. Bhatt: Yesterday Shri M. D. Joshi referred to Shri Shankarrao Deo and it is in reply to that that I am making this reference.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. We have got it. He may proceed further.

Shri C. Bhatt: They have selected a fellow like Shri Shankarrao Deo and made him a scapegoat of the whole situation. He goes to the Sarva Sevak Sangh, thence to Bhoodan. There he preaches *bhoodan*. He goes to every part of the country and says:

"सब भूमि गोपाल की"

But when it comes to Bombay, he will say, 'This *bhoomi* is for Maharashtra. Bombay is for Maharashtra'.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Gulberga): I take strong objection to this.

Shri C. Bhatt: They have selected Shri Shankarrao Deo, a very fine fellow, a very nice fellow.

Shri Kanavade Patil: These are all irrelevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do realise that a particular gentleman is respected and honoured. That is good. But so far as his political career or other things are concerned, if his opponent discusses them, we shall have to be patient to hear him also. The dignity of the House lies in this that toleration and tolerance are there. Unless we have toleration and tolerance, democracy cannot work. I would request hon. Members to be patient, though such remarks may not be agreeable to them. I would also request the hon. Member not to refer to him in such terms.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Why should a person, who is not here to defend himself, be attacked in this fashion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already said that his political activity and other matters are discussed. There is no harm in that.

Shri C. Bhatt: I will leave that point there and go ahead.

Why do Maharashtrian people want Bombay? I will give the reason. They have published a small pamphlet. They say, 'We want a homeland; we want an economic homeland'. Now Sir! There are two brains in India in connection with this problem. One is the hon. Member for Poona Central Shri Gadgil, and the other is Professor Gadgil. They have given a slogan to the Maharashtrians: Sir, when I speak about Maharashtrians, I am not speaking about those Maharashtrians at large, I

am not speaking about the Maharashtrians who are very innocent people; I am referring to those Samyukta Maharashtrians only. There is a slogan given: 'injustice, justice denied' and all these things.

In the pamphlet which is in my hand, there is a *jehad* against Gujaratis. They say:

> "Maharashtrians have taken bitter note of the fact that statements of all Congress leaders, whether on the radio or in the Press, are uniformally, conspicuously and mysteriously lacking in any reasoning whatsoever, as to why Bombay should not be wedded to its legitimate homeland. There is every jargon of interprovincial differences, virtually meaning strong objection from capitalists,—"

Now, mark the words—

> "capitalists Gujarati *banias*".

That is how they have declared a *jehad* against Gujaratis. I do not know why Shri Gadgil chose only the Gujarati capitalists and *banias*. There are capitalists in Bombay; they are Europeans, Parsis, Christians and others. I do not know why those capitalists are not chosen by Shri Gadgil. Sir, he says that Gujaratis are by and large rich people. Well, Gujaratis are not so rich. I wish Gujarat was rich. * * *

Yesterday, one Member from the Opposition—most probably Shri Khardekar—was telling us that they have the blood of Shivaji in them. Well, Sir, Shivaji was a great man. He was a great builder of an Empire. We all know that. But if they have the blood of Shivaji in their veins, with all due respect to them, I will say that Shivaji after all was a human being. Shivaji had his vices and virtues both as a human being has. But they have not adopted the virtues of Shivaji***.

You will realise, Sir, and the House will realise, the pangs that we have got inside. They have been issuing such pamphlets.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri C. Bhatt: I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

Shri Bansal: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am thankful to you for giving me this chance to participate in this debate. I am sorry that this historic moment is not being utilised, by some Members at least, in a manner in which it ought to have been utilised.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt. —South): Is the hon. Member a judge of other Members?

Shri Bansal: In my opinion, this is the fifth biggest thing that is happening in our country after independence. The first thing was the merger of the States; the second was the adoption of the Constitution; the third was our elections; the fourth was our first Five Year Plan and now, this is the fifth, that is, the consolidation of India in the reorganised Indian States. I do hope that this occasion will be ultilised by all the hon. Members in this House to see that this reorganisation takes place in a way that the foundations for the future of a happy India are laid. It is from that point of view that I will examine the Bill before the House.

From the discussions that have taken place on the floor of this House, I see that there are, in the Bill both the seeds of disruption and of consolidation. I am glad that the seeds of disruption are not so many as those of consolidation and it will be my attempt to show how such seeds of disruption can be rooted out and how all the forces that are for consolidation of our independent India are given greater strength.

For example, I am happy to see that the country will be divided into five zones. I think this is a factor which will lead to the greater consolidation and unity of our country. I hope that the Members of this House will give some greater thought as to in what manner these five zones will be working in future. I am very sorry to see that there is scepticism and objection expressed from some quarters about these five zones; but, as far as I am concerned, I think they are new foundations for the future of a prosperous India.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

When I spoke on the subject on the last occasion, I had said that we must try to eliminate from the Bill all such

* Expunged as ordered by the chair.

[Shri Bansal]

uncertain factors that might linger in our minds. One such uncertain factor has been removed, that is, Telengana. I am glad that Telengana has been merged with Andhra.

Another uncertain factor was the future of Punjab. It is gratifying that an agreement has been arrived at and I hope it will work in future. But, my difficulty with regard to that solution is that some people think that by the formation of the regions, our differences might get accentuated. It seems that while the discussions were going on between the High Command and the Akalis and the representatives of my area, there has been a meeting of minds. I hope that these regional councils will work in such a way that there is a meeting of the hearts also and that this factor of uncertainty that I see will no longer be there. That will happen only if all of us work the scheme of this Bill in a determined manner so that what we decide today is not raked up again and disturbed.

I was particularly glad to note that Loharu, which was sought to be separated from Punjab, will no longer be separated. I am also glad that Punjab and PEPSU are being integrated.

There have been demands on the floor of this House that the area of Delhi should be enlarged. I speak on this subject because those who speak of Delhi being enlarged must have, in their minds, only one area, namely, that of Hariana (*Pandit K. C. Sharma*: Western U. P.) or of western U. P. as my hon. friend reminds me, if they are willing to join.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: They are not.

Shri Bansal: But, you cannot force an outsider to come to you. I do not understand this appeal for Lebensraum. My hon. sister, the other day, said that the population of Delhi was increasing and, therefore, the area of Delhi must increase. But, I want to ask her whether it is not a fact that the population of our entire country is increasing? The population of all the States is increasing. The population of my State, the Punjab, has increased. Can we say, simply because our population has increased, therefore, more area should be tacked on to us? (*Interruptions*).

I am one with her in her demand for a democratic set-up for Delhi. I am very sorry that the Government of India have not been able to see their way to give democratic rule to the States like Delhi and Himachal Pradesh, and also the city of Bombay. I would suggest, with all the emphasis at my command, that all these Union territories are given a democratic set-up. We cannot afford to let some of our areas remain under democracy and some under bureaucracy. I think those days are past when the population, howsoever small it may be, can be satisfied by being ruled by a bureaucratic set-up. I would, therefore, appeal with all the emphasis at my command, that the Government of India should reconsider this matter and try to secure a democratic set-up for all these territories. I do not also like the name of Union territory. I think we can give a better name. I think this name smacks something of colonialism (*Interruptions*). Certainly, we can find a much better name than Union territory. I am sure the House can apply its mind to it and give some more honourable name so that my hon. friend to the left, Shri Radha Raman, does not suffer from the kind of feeling he has.

I had a number of other points to speak but, as my time is up, I will not take more time of the House. I will only say that there are certain clauses of the Bill on which I had something to say but I hope I will be allowed to present them before the Joint Committee in a written statement.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर) : इस सदन के सामने बहुत गम्भीरतापूर्वक बम्बई का सवाल रक्खा गया । कल से आज तक बम्बई के मसले पर हम ने बहुत काफी भाषण इस सदन में सुने । जहां तक बम्बई का सवाल है, मुझे सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है कि मैं समझता हूं कि यह मसला इस कदर बिगड़ चुका है कि हम इसको सम्भालने की संवारने की जितनी कोशिश करते हैं यह उतना ही उलझता जाता है । आज जो बिल गृह मंत्री महोदय ने हमारे सामने राज्य पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में रक्खा है, उसमें बम्बई का नक्शा एक यूनियन टेरिटरी (केन्द्र प्रशासित क्षेत्र) के तरीके पर आया है । बम्बई यूनियन टैरिटरी रहे या कोई और शक्ल उसकी बन जाय, वह हमारे नेताओं और इस सदन के सारे सदस्यों के देखने की बात है । मैं सिर्फ यह कहूंगा कि बम्बई हो या दिल्ली, या हिमाचल

प्रदेश हो, मेरी समझ में इन इलाकों के लोगों को जो अधिकार प्राप्त हैं उनसे उन्हे वंचित किया जाय, यह मुनासिब नहीं अथवा उचित नहीं अभी हमारी माननीय बहन सुचेता कृपालानी जी ने निहायत अच्छी दलीलें देकर यह बताया है कि दिल्ली के लोगों को बहुत वाद विवाद के पश्चात कुछ अधिकार प्राप्त हुये थे और आशा थी कि उन्हें दूसरे राज्यों के लोगों के मुताबिक अधिकार प्राप्त होंगे । परन्तु अब जो यह राज्य पुनर्गठन बिल यहां पेश किया गया है इसमें इन अधिकारों को भी वापिस ले लिया गया है । और इतना ही नहीं बल्कि और भी कुछ इलाके हैं जिनको इस कैटेगरी में शामिल कर दिया गया है, जैसे हिमाचल है, या बम्बई । सुचेताजी ने यह भी बताया है कि शुरू में जो बिल हमारे सामने आया था उसमें यह अधिकार पार्लियामेंट को दिया गया था कि इन इलाकों में किस किस्म का नक्शा बने, कैसी राज्य व्यवस्था हो, किस प्रकार के स्वशासन के अधिकार इन इलाकों के लोगों को दिये जायें । मगर अब जो बिल हमारे सामने आया है उसमें पार्लियामेंट को भी इस अधिकार से वंचित कर दिया गया है और सारे के सारे अधिकार यूनियन प्रेसीडेंट द्वारा घोषित किये जायंगे । वह जो चाहे करें अर्थात् सरकार जिस प्रकार की शासन व्यवस्था चाहे स्वयं नियत करे । राज्य पुनर्गठन की रिपोर्ट के परिणाम स्वरूप कई पार्ट सी० राज्य बड़े राज्यों में मिलाये जा रहे हैं, जैसे भोपाल, अजमेर हमारा राज्य उन राज्यों के समान तो साशित होगा ही नहीं यह सीधे केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन मनीपुर और त्रिपुरा के समान शासन व्यवस्था प्राप्त करेगा इसमें भी सन्देह होता है ।

मुझे उन बातों को दुहराने की जरूरत नहीं है कि "ग" श्रेणी के राज्यों को जो अधिकार अभी तक मिले हैं वे किस प्रकार मिले हैं और उनको प्राप्त करने के लिए उन्हें कितनी कशमकश करनी पड़ी है या संघर्ष करना पड़ा है । इस भवन के सब माननीय सदस्य इन सब बातों को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं । जो अधिकार दिये गये हैं उनको देने से पहले अच्छी तरह ऊंच नीच का विचार कर लिया गया था । एक स्वतन्त्र देश में और विशेषकर ऐसे इलाके के लोगों को जो कि अपने राइट्स (अधिकारों) के लिए कांशस (जागरूक) हों, जिनकी जमीर (चेतना) हो, जिन्होंने स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम में बड़ी से बड़ी कुर्बानी की हो, बड़ी से बड़ी मुसीबतों का सामना किया हो, बड़ी से बड़ी मुसीबत झेली हो, उनको उनके अधिकारों से वंचित करना कोई उचित बात नहीं है ।

मैं आपसे तथा इस सदन से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि कोई छः महीने हुए यह नक्शा हमारे सामने रखा गया था कि दिल्ली को "ग" श्रेणी का राज्य न रखकर इसको एक यूनियन टैरिटरी बनाया जाये । इन छः महीनों के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान के बहुत से राज्यों के मसले तय हुए हैं और हमारे नेताओं ने उन तमाम को जो उन राज्यों से ताल्लुक रखते थे, बिठाकर बातें की हैं और उलझनों को सुलझाने की कोशिश की है । मगर दिल्ली की बदकिस्मती है और साथ ही साथ बम्बई और हिमाचल की भी, कि बावजूद इस बात के कि यहां के जो प्रतिनिधि हैं, चाहे वे लोक सभा के हों और चाहे विधान सभा के, जब कभी भी उन्होंने इस बात के लिए प्रार्थना की है कि दिल्ली के मसले को जल्द तय किया जाए या यूनियन टैरिटरीज का जो मसला है उसको तय किया जाय, उसपर कभी भी गम्भीरता-पूर्वक विचार नहीं किया गया है । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि आप जितनी देरी इस नक्शे को, या यूनियन टैरिटरीज का क्या भविष्य होगा और किस तरह से वहां पर शासन चलाया जाएगा, रखने में देरी करते जाते हैं उतनी ही मायूसी लोगों में फैलती जाती है ।

मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि दिल्ली की करीब करीब २० लाख आबादी ऐसे लोगों की है जो अपने अधिकारों को बहुत अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं और जिन्होंने बड़े से बड़े काम अपने मुल्क के लिये किये हैं और आगे भी करने को तैयार हैं । अगर आज भी किसी कुर्बानी की जरूरत हो तो वे पीछे रहने वाले नहीं हैं । ऐसे इलाके के लोगों को अगर आप वाजिब अधिकार न दें और यह कहे कि तुम्हारे मसले पर बाद में सोच विचार किया जायेगा तो आप अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं कि इसका उनपर असर पड़ेगा । इस वास्ते मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूं कि आप इस मामले पर अवश्य रोशनी डालें और हमें बतायें कि आप क्या करने का विचार करते हैं । अगर आप यह कहते जायें कि हम दूसरे मसलों पर गौर कर रहे हैं और आपका मसला बाद में लिया जायेगा तो यह कोई तसल्ली देनेवाली बात न होगी । दिल्ली में तीन सौ गांव हैं जिनके मुस्तकबिल के बारे में किसी को भी कुछ मालूम नहीं है । गांव वाले हमसे पूछते क्या तय

[श्री राधा रमण]

हुआ है। शहर के अन्दर जो सिविक एडिमनिस्ट्रेशन (नागरिक प्रशासन) है उसका भी झगड़ा बराबर चला आता है। आज दिल्ली स्टेट ने भी, विधान सभा ने भी, सभी ने इस बात को माना है कि सिविक एडिमनिस्ट्रेशन और राज्य अधिकार का दर्जा अलग अलग है और यहां पर एक अच्छी कारपोरेशन होनी चाहिए, एक मजबूत कारपोरेशन होनी चाहिए, लेकिन उसकी तरफ अभी तक ो कदम नहीं बढ़ा है। क्या अधिकार हमको आगे मिलने वाले हैं। और क्या कुछ नकशा देहली को मिलने वाला है इसके सम्बन्ध में यह बिल गोल है। इस बिल में सिर्फ यह कह दिया गया है कि इस मसले को प्रेजिडेन्ट के हुक्म से तय किया जायेगा या इन मसलों पर गौर बाद में किया जायेगा। इसे मैं मुनासिब नहीं मानता हूं। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि यदि हमारे नेताओं का यह खयाल है कि इस मसले को देर से भी तय कर सकते हैं और देर में यह अच्छी तरह से तय हो जाएगा तो उनका यह ख्याल ठीक नहीं है। जितनी देर से यह मसला तय होगा उतनी ज्यादा उलझनें इसको तय करने में पैदा होती जायेंगी। साथ ही अगर किसी के दिमाग में यह बात है कि दिल्ली की जनता अपने अधिकारों की रक्षा करने के लिए तथा अपनी मांग को मनवाने के लिए तैयार नहीं है तो मैं कहूंगा कि उनका यह खयाल भी सही नहीं है। आज दिल्ली की जनता यह नहीं चाहती है कि वह ऐसे रास्ते अखत्यार करे कि जिससे हमारे नेता जो कई चीजों में उलझे हुए हैं या बड़े बड़े मसलों को तय करने में लगे हुए हैं, अधिक तकलीफ में पड़ जायें या उनकी दिक्कतों में इजाफा हो। मैं यह बात दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि दिल्ली एक ऐसी जगह है कि जहां केन्द्रीय सरकार की नीति को सही तौर पर समझा जाता है। चाहे वह सैक्युलरिज्म (धर्म निरपेक्षता) हो, चाहे वह राजनीति हो, चाहे वह स्वतंत्रता संग्राम हो, चाहे वह स्वयं अधिकारों की रक्षा हो, इन सब बातों को यहां की जनता सही ढंग से सोचती है। ऐसे इलाके की जनता को उसके अधिकारों से वंचित कर देना, मैं समझता हूं, एक गैर वाजिब बात है, इसमें न इंसाफ है, और न ही न्याय है। यह मसला आज दिल्ली तक ही महदूद नहीं है, अब यह बम्बई का मसला भी है और हिमाचल का भी। इनके अलावा और भी तीन छोटे इलाके मौजूद हैं। जैसे मनीपुर, त्रिपुरा, आदि। मैं गृह मंत्री से प्रार्थना करता कि वे अब देरी न करके जो भी नक्शा देहली तथा अन्य मनियन टेरीटरीज को वह चाहतें हैं उसे हमारे सामने रखें ताकि हम उसे स्टडी (अध्ययन) कर सकें और देख सकें कि वह हमारी आवश्यकताओं और आकांक्षाओं के अनुसार है अथवा नहीं और कहां तक हमारी जरूरियात को पूरा करता है।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से तथा सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जो लोग स्वतन्त्रता के पुजारी है, जिनके हाथों से हमने यह अधिकार आज से पांच साल पहले प्राप्त किये थे वे उन अधिकारों से किसी भी इलाके की जनता को वंचित न करें। और जो राय हम लोगों की है या तो उसके अनुसार अन्यथा कोई ऐसा नक्शा हमारे सामने शीघ्र रखें जिससे यह मायूसी जो दिन-प्रति दिन बढ़ती जा रही है, दूर हो और दिल्ली के लोगों को भी इस बात का भरोसा हो कि दिल्ली के मसले का भी हल होने जा रहा है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह उम्मीद करता हूं कि हमारे नेताओं का इस तरफ ध्यान जायेगा और जो कुछ मैंने कहा है वे उस पर संजीदगी के साथ गौर करेंगे।

Dr. Gangadhara Siva (Chittoor—Reserved-Sch. Castes): I would like first to congratulate the hon. Home Minister for having brought forward this Bill for consideration here. I call this Bill a sacred one, which is delivered from the sacred hands of our beloved Minister, with his magnetic personality above all Members of the House. It is sacred in the sense that it is a Bill which is to guide the destiny of India to a prosperous stage and which is to guide the future generation.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): Not only destiny but density.

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: A man of his calibre may know that. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not compliment the authors of the S.R.C. Report. They are all eminent people of great qualities, academically well qualified, mature politicians and above all they do not belong to any party. I call them the modern *Trimurtis*, Brahma, Vishnu and Maheshwara, who have carved the map of India for its prosperity, unity and integrity and above all, for the development of the various States. It is on the persistent demand of the country that the S.R.C. came into existence and they have done the job to the best of their ability. I do not know the reason why the Members in the Parliament who are representing various constituencies and who were somewhere affected started

their violence which, ultimately, ended in arson, looting and murder of officials who are the custodians of law and order. The whole world is watching as to what repercussions would take place in India—whether it would end in disruption and disunity. In particular, one of our immediate friends, who is a chicken-hearted fellow and whose object is to indulge in scandals about India and spoil the fair name of India, is also watching. (*Interruptions.*)

An Hon. Member: Who is he?

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: It was Andhra which pointed to the world that India stands for democratic Government and socialist pattern of society under the leadership of our beloved Prime Minister, who is the peace messenger of the world carrying the banner of Panch Shila. I come to my own subject, with regard to Bellary.

An Hon. Member: It is not his own subject; it is a general question.

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: Bellary is my contiguous area, belonging to Rayalaseema for centuries together. The existence of Tungabhadra project is on account of the labour, blood and sweat of our great Andhra leaders. The Chief Minister of Mysore has cast his evil eye on this most unfortunate part of the country. It is the most unfortunate land on the face of earth which, I remind this Parliament, is forsaken by God and forgotten by the Government. During the recent famine, it is our beloved Prime Minister who diverted military resources to sink wells and rush food to the needy. Where were the Mysore people at that time? How can they claim Bellary now? It is nothing short of territorial ambition. Under these circumstances, I have been sent with a special mandate by my electors to hammer the Treasury Benches. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I have only heard the last words: "hammer the Treasury Benches". I am very sorry that the hon. Member should use those words. I do not think he has anything in his mind like that. I will request him to kindly weigh his words before he utters them and not to use such expressions in future. (*Interruptions.*)

Dr. Gangadhara Siva: I have no such intention. Let them polish their minds and revise their decision in favour of Andhra's claim over Bellary.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): It is right to remember that first things must come first. What was the idea that was at the back of the minds of those who thought of the reorganisation of the States. The basic idea was that there should be greater unity in the country. The country should be made absolutely secure and there should be a fillip and impetus given to its economic growth and development.

In order to appreciate the subject-matter of this debate, it will be well worth our while to cast our eyes for a moment, beyond our borders. What is happening there? That will give us a good lesson and that will tell us the correct approach to the problem that is being debated here this afternoon. Pakistan has realised that it is dangerous to remain devided as she was. Pakistan cannot, with equanimity tolerate the growth of this country as a first-class nation having a voice in the affairs of the world. There is the cry of *jehad* there. Seventy per cent. of her Budget funds are being devoted towards armaments. There is the American armaments aid to boot. The tribesmen want permission to invade Kashmir. Certain western powers, for the purpose of encirclement, want bases nearabout Kashmir. This is the state of affairs. Let us borrow a leaf from the book of Pakistan; Pakistan has a sermon to preach to us. What has she done? In West Pakistan, there were four States—West Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind. (*An hon. Member*: Bhawalpur) My friend adds Bahawalpur. They have been merged into one unit.

What do we find here? Fissiparous tendencies have developed—We want division on linguistic basis, division on racial basis, division on petty territorial basis. The growing need of this country is this. All those forces that seem to thwart our progress towards unity, which jeopardise our security, which stand in the way of our economic growth—all these forces should be curbed, if they cannot be totally exterminated. These forces are raised by linguistic fanaticism. Some people are hungry for loaves and fishes for several little gains for office and posts. They

[Shri Tek Chand]

want to cling to their posts like leeches. With that object, the cry and the slogan are raised—language in danger, petty territories in danger, culture in danger. The growing need of this nation is big territorial units. I endorse every word of the speech of the hon. Shri Giri this morning when he said that we did not want Bombay or Maharashtra or Punjab or Bengal but five centralised zonal States. That is what we want.

Talking nearer home, so far as the border territories are concerned, the territories which will be the first to bear the burnt of *jehad*, if any, should be strengthened.

4 P.M.

Therefore, a strong Punjab, with PEPSU, with Himachal Pradesh, with Delhi, with Jammu and Kashmir even, is most desirable. We want common plans for our rehabilitation, we want common schemes for our development, we want common measure for our industries and for our economic growth, and we want common defence so far as the territories may be in danger in a particular manner. Only then it will be possible for us to conceive of the ideas of one nation and, one country. Let there be a big State, a big territorial unit, where there are not one or two but multilingual units. That is the necessity. But we are talking of things not at all germane to the unity of the nation. We are talking of matters which lead to parochial patriotism, which lead to fissiparous tendencies, which lead to balkanisation of the nation. This rot must be stemmed, whether it is on the basis of Punjab Hindus *versus* Punjab Sikhs or on the basis of Maharashtrians *versus* Gujeratis.

Sir, talking of Punjab, great wisdom has been shown by our leaders, great tolerance has been shown in permitting certain interests to come and have pourparleys, those who have been abusing them right and left to those who have been criticising them in a most violent manner. They had long palavers with them. They endeavoured even to placate them. I am not sorry so long as the idea that our leaders had in view has been achieved, so long as other interests have been satisfied. But I do hope that once satisfaction has been secured, that should not be treated as a stepping ground for greater demands, for opening their mouths still wider, to the detriment of greater national interests.

An hon. Member said—I am referring to my hon. friend Lala Achint Ram—that there were three parties, speaking broadly, who seem not to be satisfied. Today there is a party who style themselves as, may be followers of Maha Punjab or Jan Sanghis. Whatever it is, they have not got any particular name. They are keen to see that their point of view is heard; may be, that they are asking for things that cannot be, under the circumstances of the case, granted to them *in toto*. Nevertheless, if they are dissatisfied, at least give them a hearing. Let them have the satisfaction that their point of view has been heard and examined. After their point of view is heard, if a decision is arrived at, that is more than enough.

There have been protests made on behalf of two territories in the speeches made today—Delhi and Himachal Pradesh. Their attitude seems to be the attitude of a boy who wants to eat the cake as well as have it. They feel that they are being deprived of benefits of a democratic institution. I concede that. But it is for Himachal Pradesh, with their 11 lakhs population, to go and join the bigger unit and enjoy the democratic privileges. They say: "No'. Carve out for our 11 lakhs population a new State. We must have all the paraphernalia of a democratic institution. What about Delhi? Out of a population of 18 lakhs, a vast majority of them speak Punjabi. They are of Punjabi origin. If they want a democratic set up then join them with Punjab.

There is one important matter and that is about High Courts. It is absolutely necessary that we should have bigger High Courts. They will command greater prestige. It is curious that, Himachal Pradesh has one Judicial Commissioner's court presided over by an officer of the status of District Judge, but for purposes of judicial administration Himachal Pradesh should be brought under a High Court. There is no politics involved in it. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary and desirable that for the purposes of judicial administration there should be one big High Court instead of small Judicial Commissioner's courts.

Lastly, I wish to say a few words about new State's capital. I do not understand my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh saying that Patiala has claims to be considered as capital. Chandigarh is a place where crores of rupees had been invested or sunk. Chandigarh is now the pride of the whole of India. The whole world knows about the newly planned capital city conceived in a new style and executed in a new pattern. Crores of rupees had been spent on it. Now all of a sudden Patiala's claim is put up. The result of these irresponsible statements made by certain responsible people is that there is consternation which retards the growth and development of that town whereby investors get shy and the town cannot be developed. The Government have thought of building Chandigarh. Chandigarh is going to be the pride of the country. There is no reason why the capital should be changed.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes) : Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to associate myself in this debate. But, at the same time, I am very sorry that this question of reorganisation of States has released forces which we never expected and which would even threaten or undermine the very stability of our nation.

When this question of reorganisation of States was taken up, some of us thought that it would be handled not in a partisan way and that it would be tackled in a national way. But, it was the will or the desire of the Party in power to see that it should be decided or settled in a sectarian line. I must tell you, Sir, that for the releasing of these latent, anti-national, communal, caste and reactionary forces in the country ever since the question of reorganisation of States came,—I must also say, the tribal forces in the country— the Congress Party is more responsible— I think I can even say that the Congress Party alone is responsible. They should not blame anybody else now. During these days we were witnessing the heat produced in this House. How and between whom ? It is not between the Opposition and the Congress Party, but it is among the Congress Members themselves that the fight is going on. This is a national question and this should have been solved in a national way, but the Government made a kind of sectarian approach.

What was the basic or fundamental reason for releasing these forces at this hour. The basic reason was that the Government have not approached this problem or any problem of India in the past from a doctrinarie stand-point. They have completely ignored the basic or fundamental principle for building up a new social order, or a socialistic society in India when they took up the Reorganisation. The complete neglect of this factor is responsible for the release of these latent forces.

As far as my state is concerned, we have got what we demanded. Perhaps, I think in the whole of India, in respect of the question of reorganisation of States, the happiest lot is the people of Kerala, because we have got a Kerala State for which we had aspired. But we had never agitated in the past, because we knew that the States Reorganisation was not the be-all-and-end-all of India's needs it was only a means to an end, it was to build up a socialist order in the country. That is why we have never fought like cocks,—as we witness here in the House every day—for the creation of a Kerala State.

I should say that there are reactionary forces even in that State. Some Members here have voiced their claim for the creation of a Dakshina Desh or a State for South India. I do not know what benefit will accrue of it, unless, of course, it is a partisan view. Of course my State is under the President's rule today. I could certainly tell you that, of course, within a year or so we will be having a Government of our own, and we are very confident that we will be having a Government of our own left party too. It may not be liked by other parties. But at the same time, I can tell you that certainly we will be having a Government under the Constitution framed by this Parliament and we will be working it better than anybody else.

Let me now come to the Maharashtrian point of view. It is a very pitiable thing that much heat has been produced on the question of Bombay. I have got every respect for every Gujarati living in the country. The reason, perhaps, is that we who belong to this generation were cradled by the greatest Gujarati. I must say that it is rather unfair to call him the greatest Gujarati. He is the Father of the Nation, and we have had the fortune to have been born in the land where he was also

[Shri Velayudhan]

born. Therefore, I have always respect for a Gujarati, whether he belongs to this sect or that sect. It is my humble opinion that, whatever sacrifices it might result, we must respect and this country must respect the sentiment of the people of Gujarat. I am not saying that Bombay should be conceded to the Gujaratis or it should go to the Centre or not. Some reasonable formula should be evolved so that the interests of the Gujaratis could be conceded. It is not a question of the Maharashtrians alone. It is a question for the whole of the people of India to look after. Therefore, whatever be the rights and wrongs of that question, it is my humble opinion that the sentiments and feelings that are expressed by the Gujaratis should be respected and a final solution should be sought in that light.

An Hon. Member: What about the Marathis?

Shri Velayudhan: I said that the Maharashtrians should have a State of their own. I stand for linguistic unit. I am for that.

Shri Nambiar: What about Bombay?

Shri Velayudhan: I say that Bombay should go to Maharashtra. You have not understood what I meant. That is the difficulty. I should tell you that Gandhiji stood for a non-violent attitude towards all problems. We should also, in the same way, solve this problem of Bombay, otherwise there is danger for us all.

I shall speak a few words now about the State of Delhi where from we are now discussing these questions. It is my humble opinion that Delhi should have a democratic set-up. In the same way, Himachal Pradesh also should have a democratic set-up. It must continue as a separate entity. Let us not always think in terms of big, large units in the country. We have suffered a lot because of that. In working out a socialistic social order it would be very much better to have a number of smaller States. Take, for example, a small State like Vindhya Pradesh. It has made wonderful developments in the last five years' time. I must say that no State in India has made so much progress in the last five years as Vindhya Pradesh has made. In the same way, all the other units having Legislatures should have separate democratic set-up and be separate entities.

Shri N. P. Nathwani (Sorath): I am thankful to you for having given me an opportunity to speak during this debate, though at its fag-end. My friend Shri C. C. Shah spoke about the position regarding Bombay. He spoke with his accustomed clarity of thought and expression. I merely wish to reinforce his arguments by a few words of mine. He said that this formula which has been set out in this Bill regarding Bombay represents the largest measure of agreement under the circumstances narrated by him. Being essentially a compromise it is not likely to satisfy all aspirations of all people. For instance, Bombay is being relegated to a Centrally-administered enclave. The Maharashtrian brethren who demand the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra seek to base their arguments partly on the ground of sentiment and partly on the ground of reason.

I shall first deal with the argument about the sentiment. I do realise and do admit that there exists a very strong feeling, and the non-inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra has evoked the most bitter feelings among the Maharashtrians. It has led to a feeling of frustration and injustice. But the most pertinent question should be this: whether there is a justification about this or not. Who whipped up this fury? Who created this feeling amongst them? In my humble opinion, it was the sustained campaign of incitement to violence carried on by the linguistic tingods and leftist leaders. What should have been their approach?

Shri Nambiar: Why leftists?

Sardar A. S. Saigal: They are the main cause.

Shri N. P. Nathwani: As the time at my disposal is very short, I refuse to take any notice of such interruptions. What should have been the approach towards this question? My learned friend pointed out that there was one Maharashtrian leader, a man of saintly character, who advised them, I shall quote his words, the words of that learned man. He said:

> "When two brothers are quarrelling and when there is some dispute regarding the property, the

father comes and says, 'your shares can be given to you, but neither of you would get the thing to which you are quarrelling. I myself will keep the property".

This was the sentiment, the spirit, in which the scheme has been envisaged by the Congress Working Committee, and then by the Central Government who have incorporated this provision in the Bill.

It will be worthwhile remembering the advice which Acharya Vinobha Bhave gave to us in this matter. He says :

"As a Maharashtrian, I shall claim Bombay, but let the Gujaratis decide."

Let us ponder over the implications of this statement. He says three things. Firstly, he recognises the vital interests of the Gujaratis, meaning thereby the other communities.

An Hon. Member : How?

Shri N. P. Nathwani : He mentions the Gujaratis because they constitute the next most important group of community in Bombay. Not merely he recognises the vital interests of other communities, but he also proceeds to say that it should be decided with their concurrence. The third thing which is implied is that any solution that you may arrive at is to be arrived at in a peaceful, co-operative spirit. If this spirit or if this approach had been brought to the notice of the Maharashtrians, this fury would not have been whipped up.

I pass to the other ground of the claim, namely, the ground of reason. They say it is unwise and it is unjust. In order to examine this argument, we have to have a proper perspective. Friends after friends have stated that Bombay has a special position not merely in relation to Maharashtra, not merely in relation to Gujarat but to India as a whole. I do not want to recapitulate the whole argument. But when you view the question in the broad perspective of national unity and economy, it becomes obvious that some special treatment has to be given to the case of Bombay. There is no other city, not even Madras, not even Calcutta, which can bear comparison with the position of Bombay. Reasons have been given out. I do not want to recapitulate them.

Then my friend Shri Gadgil made a statement to which I shall presently like to refer. But before I deal with that. I would say a few words regarding the point raised by my friend Shri Feroze Gandhi. He said that Maharashtra is the natural hinterland of Bombay and that all the economic forces converge on this point, and that therefore, Bombay should be made the capital of Maharashtra. There seems to be a lot of confusion in his mind as regard hinterland. As has been pointed out, even from the geographical point of view, Gujarat stands on the northern side; there is a very narrow strip of land which separates the mainland of Gujarat from Bombay. He confuses between the physical link and the economic link. I would draw his attention to certain facts about the true position of the hinterland relating to Bombay. Now as to the question what is the total import and export of commodities at the port of Bombay and where they come from, it must be remembered that the port of Bombay alone accounts for nearly 55 per cent. of the total imports of the country and 40 per cent. of the total exports. In the strict sense of the term, the hinterland of Bombay extends far beyond Gujarat and Maharashtra and covers a large part of the country from where the export commodities come and to which the imported articles go. In a vast country like India, particularly when we have undertaken the task of mobilising our resources through planning, the economic resources are bound to cut across the linguistic frontiers. A river valley project can run through three States and can bring prosperity to all the three regions. Any narrow concept of regional ownership of economic resources inspired by linguistic parochialism is bound to make nonsense of all concepts of planning.

Therefore, even if it is said that Maharashtra is the exclusive physical hinterland of Bombay, still the broad picture of this economic hinterland should be borne in mind.

I want to say one word about Shri Gadgil's point. He categorically stated that the claim for the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra was accepted by the Prime Minister and it was only a question of prestige for the Government

[Shri N. P. Nathwani]

and he wanted the Government to make a declaration in regard to the time-limit. I do not know how far it is true, but I want to know about this. The Prime Minister has stated on several occasions that the question can be reopened and reconsidered after the recent wounds that have been inflicted on Bombay are healed up. That means that at a later time, the question is likely to be reviewed. But, does it necessarily follow that Bombay should go to Maharashtra? Is this the only alternative? Are there not various other alternatives also? Even if there are no alternatives, we want this assurance, namely, that whatever is done about Bombay will be done with the mutual trust and co-operation of all the parties concerned. If no such decision is taken, I would say that it is a very wrong thing on the part of any hon. Member to say categorically that a decision has been taken or to circulate reports of such a tendentious character, because it creates all sorts of hopes and then it leads to disappointment, frustration and bitterness. I will, therefore, request the hon. Home Minister to clarify the position and tell us definitely what the intentions of the Government are in this matter and whether any solution that may be suggested will be with the co-operation and consent of all the parties concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Before I call Shri Laskar, I request the hon. Home Minister to move his amendment.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I beg to move:

> That in the motion, *after* "and 17 members from Rajya Sabha" *add*:
>
> "with directions to include in the Bill such provisions for the amendment of the First and Fourth Schedules to the Constitution as may be necessary".

I want to submit that this amendment is in pursuance of the observation that was made by the Speaker this morning.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

> That in the motion, *after* "and 17 members from Rajya Sabha" *add*:
>
> "with directions to include in the Bill such provisions for the amendment of the First and Fourth Schedules to the Constitution as may be necessary".

Shri Laskar (Cachar—Lushai Hills—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, Assam is said to be unaffected by the reorganisation of States. That only shows that hon. Members of the House do not care to know about Assam. I would like to submit that not only Assam has been greatly affected by the reorganisation of States, but the unity and security and solidarity of the whole of India have been greatly affected. Before I dwell on this matter, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to certain important matters.

I shall take up the question of linguistic minority. The hon. Home Minister was kind enough to tell us in his opening speech on the S.R.C. Report that the interests of the linguistic minorities would be safeguarded. But, we do not find anything in the Bill about this. It has been left to the Zonal Councils. I doubt whether the interests of the linguistic minorities will be safeguarded by the Zonal Councils. For instance, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh will have one Council and if there is some Marathi linguistic minority community, its problems may or may not be discussed by the Zonal Council.

As regards Assam, I come from the Cachar District, which is a Bengali-speaking area and there we are still having the privilege of having the Bengali language in the primary and secondary stages. But I find that in the Constitution the safeguard is given only up to the primary stage. Therefore, the Bengali-speaking minorities in my area may feel that in future their interests may not be safeguarded. I want that any feeling of distrust and fear should be removed from the minds of the minority communities by making some provision in the Bill itself.

I welcome the merger of Telengana with Andhra, the merger of Vidharba with Maharashtra and the proposed merger of Bengal with Bihar. On the one hand we are welcoming the formation of Zones, but on the other hand, we have increased the number of Union territories from 3, as recommended by the S.R.C., to 7. I do not understand why Manipur and Tripura cannot be merged with the neighbouring States. I find that the S.R.C. recommendations and the opinion of the Assam Pradesh Congress Committee have been ignored in this matter. It is the opinion of our Chief Minister that, from the point of view of national security and the unity

of India, it will appear clearly that the entire region of the North East needs an integrated administration and should form one administrative homogenous unit so that it can be developed as a self-sufficient economic zone under a plan. Our Assam Pradesh Congress Committee unanimously adopted a resolution in February last demanding the merger of Manipur and Tripura with Assam. It was also reiterated in the political conference in Barpeta in the month of February.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh (Inner Manipur): You first join West Bengal and Bihar; we are ready to join you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should not interfere in this way; it is not fair.

Shri Laskar: The S.R.C. also recommended the merger of Tripura with Assam. They also recommended that ultimately Manipur should join Assam, but for the time being it may remain as a Centrally administered area. But, in the Bill we find that not only has Manipur been taken away, but Tripura also has been taken away. By keeping Manipur and Tripura away, you are inviting two dangers. Unsocial elements will find a place to work in a small area. There will be a demand for a separate State from each hill district also because the position is similar. In each state of Manipur and Tripura, the annual income is from Rs. 35 lakhs to 50 lakhs and the Centre gives a grant of about Rs. 150 lakhs. If you keep these alone as Union territories, what will happen to the other hill districts? They will also come forward to become Union territories. This is the danger. Manipur and Tripura want a democratic form of Government. The point is whether with this income they can have a democratic form of Government. But, this is a legitimate demand. Therefore they will have to merge with Assam. Another danger is this. There are some unsocial elements there. If we encourage this in a border area, in a strategic position, it is dangerous. Our hon. friend Shri Rishang Keishing said, we do not want to remain within the pocket of the hon. Home Minister as a Union territory, we want responsible Government. We also say that they should get responsible Government. They will remain in the lower pocket of our Home Minister. In these border areas, they will be detected for this movements by pick-pockets roaming outside our border. Some day a pick-pocket will come and take them away. That is my apprehension. I want the hon. Home Minister to give thought to this matter. While they are contemplating bigger States, zones, etc., with the merger of so many States, I think it will be better and helpful for the country if Manipur and Tripura are merged with Assam. Because of its strategic position, encouragement of such an integrated development of this region seems essential in order that it may play its role as a strong bulwark for the defence of north-eastern border of the Indian Republic. We cannot neglect its development and unity. This was the recommendation of the S.R.C.

Lastly, I would only refer to the recommendation of the S.R.C. They said:

> "While we make this recommendation, it is quite clear to us that Manipur cannot maintain its separate existence for long and that the ultimate solution should be its merger in the adjoining State of Assam. It is equally clear to us that, so long as it continues as a separate administrative unit, the administrative structure of Manipur should conform to the pattern we have indicated in Chapter I of this part. We wish to repeat that, if a unit such as Manipur wishes to have representative government at the state level, it must be prepared to join a larger unit. It cannot insist on a separate existence and demand, at the same time, substantial central aid not only for its economic development....."

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member's time is up. I have rung the bell twice. He is not attending to that. He is reading a long para. I think he should bring his remarks to a close.

Shri Laskar: I am finishing.

> "but also for the maintenance of expensive representative institutions and uneconomic administrative agencies."

Therefore, I appeal to the Members of the House, to the Joint Committee and the Home Minister to take into consideration all the points urged by me.

श्री ज्वाला प्रसाद : अब तक आप उन प्रान्तों के बारे में, दो रोज से बहस सुन रहे हैं, जिनमें बड़े बड़े झगड़े और बड़े बड़े विवाद थे । मैं एक बहुत छोटे से प्रान्त से आता हूं जिसको स्टेट्स

[श्री ज्वाला प्रसाद]

रिआर्गेनाइजेशन रिपोर्ट (राज्य पुनर्गठन प्रतिवेदन) में राजस्थान के साथ मिलाने की सिफारिश की गयी ह ।

अजमेर सी स्टेट (ग-राज्य) है लेकिन अगर उसका पुराना इतिहास देखा जाये तो मालूम होगा कि पिछले डेढ़ सौ बरस से वह सीधा भारत सरकार द्वारा शासित होता आया है । वह कोई ऐसी सी स्टेट नहीं है जो कि सन् १९५२ में वजूद में आयी हो । वह पहले राजपूताना एजेंसी के बीच में था । इस सिलसिले में मुझे महाराष्ट्र का नाम भी लेना पड़ेगा । बहुत पहले अजमेर में पेशवाओं का राज्य था । लेकिन एक बार जब पेशवा अंग्रेजों से दक्षिण में हारे तो उन्होंने अजमेर अंग्रेजों को पेश कर दिया । अंग्रेजों ने अजमेर को इसलिए ले लिया क्योंकि वहां से राजस्थान के राजाओं पर अच्छी तरह से नियंत्रण रखा जा सकता था । अंग्रेजों के वक्त में अजमेर में एजेंट टू दी गवर्नर जनरल रहा करते थे और वहां पर भारत सरकार की ओर से एक चीफ कमिश्नर शासन करता था । इस तरह से वहां की सात लाख जनता का भार सीधा भारत सरकार पर रहा है । इस डेढ़ सौ साल में भारत सरकार द्वारा अजमेर का शासन जिस अच्छी तरह से चलाया गया उसके लिए मैं भारत सरकार का सात लाख जनता की ओर से आभार प्रदर्शित करता हूं । मुझे यह कहना पड़ता है कि वहां के लिए भारत सरकार ने जो व्यवस्था की थी वह राजस्थान से ऊंची थी । आज वहां शिक्षा का यह हाल है कि वह मद्रास के बाद दूसरे नम्बर पर है । वहां हर गाँव में स्कूल है, हर गांव में अस्पताल है और दूसरी सुविधायें हैं । इसके लिए हम लोग भारत सरकार के बहुत ममनून (आभारी) हैं । लेकिन जब हम लोग अजमेर को भारत सरकार द्वारा राजस्थान से मिलने कि बात सुनते है तो हम सात लाख लोगों के हृदय भारी हो जाते हे । उसका कारण है । पहले मत्स्य राजस्थान का इनागुरेशन (उद्घाटन) हुआ । उसके एक महीने बाद काका साहब गाडगिल के हाथों जो कि उस समय सेंटर में मिनिस्टर थे कोटा में छोटे राजस्थान का इनागुरेशन (उद्घाटन) हुआ । इसके बाद उससे बड़े राजस्थान का पंडितजी ने उदयपुर में इनागुरेशन किया और उसके बाद जोधपुर और जयपुर आये । मैं कह सकता हूं कि अगर आप उस वक्त के हालात को पढ़ेंगे तो आपको मालूम होगा कि सरदार पटेल ने उस वक्त बड़ी ताकत के साथ इन देशी राज्यों को काबू में किया था ।

उस वक्त बहुत बड़ा डर था कि कहीं जोधपुर के महाराज और दूसरे लोग इस तरह का कोई षडयंत्र न करें और जिन्ना साहब से कोई साठ-गांठ न कर बैठें जो देश के लिए अहितकर और घातक सिद्ध हो और ऐसी स्थिति न आने देने के लिए स्वर्गीय सरदार पटेल ने जिनके कि हाथ में रियासती विभाग की बागडोर थी सारे देशी राजाओं को एक जगह पर इकट्ठा किया। उस समय अजमेर की मांग थी कि हमको राजस्थान में मिला दिया जाये और इसके लिए रेजूलेशंस (संकल्प) पास किये गये और इसके लिए प्राविशियल कांग्रेस कमेटी (प्रांतीय कांग्रेस समिति) और दूसरे राजनैतिक सम्मेलनों के द्वारा इसकी मांग की गई और सब ने मांग की कि हमको तुरन्त राजस्थान में मिला देना चाहिए। राजस्थान प्राविशयल कांग्रेस कमेटी जो उदयपुर हाउस दिल्ली में बैठी थी, उसमें १०० में से ८० आदमियों ने अजमेर को राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाने के हक में वोट दिया । अजमेर के ६ लाख निवासियों की ओर से उसको राजस्थान में मिलाने की मांग की गई लेकिन उस समय सरदार पटेल ने ऐसा करना देश के बड़े हित में उपयुक्त न समझा और अजमेर को राजस्थान में नहीं मिलाया गया और किया यह गया कि राजस्थान के लिए एक महाराज प्रमुख बना दिया गया, यहां पर यह ध्यान रखने योग्य बात है कि राजस्थान के अतिरिक्त कहीं पर भी महाराजप्रमुख नहीं बनाया गया । उदयपुर के महाराज को महाराजप्रमुख बना दिया गया और जयपुर के राजा को राजप्रमुख बनाया गया और जयपुर का चीफ मिनिस्टर बनाया गया और जयपुर को राजधानी । राजस्थान बनने के वक्त अजमेर के लोगों ने चाहा था कि उनको राजस्थान में मिला दिया जाय ताकि जो हमारी सही जगह है वह हमें राजस्थान की पिक्चर (चित्र) में प्राप्त हो जाये लेकिन उस समय अजमेर को राजस्थान से अलग रक्खा गया । अगर भौगोलिक दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो अजमेर राजस्थान के बीचोंबीच में स्थित है और उसके अलावा राजस्थान की कोई दूसरी राजधानी बन ही नहीं सकती, लेकिन खैर उस वक्त अजमेर को अलग ही रखना मुनासिब समझा गया । उस वक्त जो एक स्पेशल कमेटी बैठी थी उसने प्रोविजनली (अस्थायी रूप से) जयपुर को कैपिटल (राजधानी) माना है । मैं समझता हूं कि आज जब अजमेर को राजस्थान में शामिल किया जा रहा है तो राजस्थान के नक्शे में जो उसकी मुनासिब और सही जगह होनी चाहिये, वह भारत सरकार को देनी चाहिये । उस वक्त हमको भारत सरकार ने राजस्थान में मिलने से

रोका, आज इस बात का अवसर है कि उस समय जो सारे राजस्थान के लोग चाहते थे कि अजमेर राजथान में मिलाया जाय और वही उसकी राजधानी बने, तो आज वह काम करना चाहिए और उसको राजधानी बनाना चाहिए । आज जब आप अजमेर को राजस्थान म मिलाने जा रहे हैं तो जैसी कि सारे राजस्थान की मांग थी, अजमेर को राजस्थान में उसकी सही स्थान दिलवायें और ऐसा करना कोई नई बात नहीं होगी बल्कि जो चीज उसको आज से पांच साल पहले मिलने वाली थी, वह आज आप दे रहे हैं । मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसा करना भारत सरकार की और इस संसद् के सदस्यगणों की नैतिक जिम्मेदारी है कि अजमेर को राजस्थान के नक्शे में उसकी सही जगह मिलने चाहिए । हमें पंतजी और कांग्रेस सरकार से उम्मीद है कि वे हमारे साथ पूरी तरह न्याय करेंगे और आज जो वह हमको राजस्थान में मिलने का हुक्म दे रहे हैं तो वह हमें मानना ही है लेकिन इतनी प्रार्थना जरूर है कि ६ लाख आदमियों का खयाल किया जायेगा जो कि डेढ़ करोड़ आदमियों के साथ मिलने जा रहे हैं । अक्सरियत के लिए सरकार को देखना होगा कि कहीं वह जो अल्पमत में हैं उन पर गलबा (प्रभुत्व) हासिल न कर लें । डेढ़ करोड़ की आबादी के राजस्थान में ६ लाख आबादी वाले अजमेर की जनता राजनैतिक माइनोरिटी में है ।

मैं और अधिक न कह कर सिर्फ इतना पंत जी और कांग्रेस के कर्णधारों से अपील करूंगा कि वे अजमेर के ६ लाख निवासियों का हित अपने ध्यान में रक्खें और आज जो उनको राजस्थान में मिलाने का हुक्म दिया जा रहा है और जिसको कि अजमेर निवासी बजा ला रहे हैं, उसमें यह सरकार की नैतिक जिम्मेदारी हो जाती है कि अजमेर को राजस्थान की पिक्चर में उसकी सही जगह दिलाई जाये ।

Shri L. Jogeshwar Singh : On a point of information. May I know whether any Member from Manipur, Tripura or Himachal Pradesh has spoken so far in this debate ?

Mr. Chairman : Order, order, Unfortunately, this is not question hour, and no such question can be put to the Chair.

चौ० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : हमारे देश के नेताओं ने पंजाब का जो एक इतना कठिन मसला दरपेश था उसका एक ऐसा हल निकाला है जिससे पंजाब के करीब ८० प्रतिशत: आदमी जिनके कि पास कोई अखबार नहीं, जो बोलना नहीं जानते और जो अपनी आवाज बुलन्द नहीं कर सकते हैं और जो अपनी मांग और आवाज नेताओं के कानों तक नहीं पहुंचा सकते है, आज वह इस समस्या के हल हो जाने से खुश हैं । हमारे लुधियाना, अमृतसर और जालंधर के कई एक दोस्त यह समझते हैं कि शायद यह जो पंजाब की समस्या का हल निकाला गया है, इससे सिक्खों को कुछ मिल गया ह । अगर कुछ मिलने के सवाल के ऊपर गौर किया जाय तो सभापति महोदय, जैसा कि आपको भी मालूम है, अगर किसी को मिला है तो वह हरियाने और कांगड़ा के ५०, ६० लाख लोग हैं जिनकी कि ओर आज तक पंजाब सरकार ने देखा भी नहीं था, उनको कुछ मिला है । आपको मालूम ही है कि जहां तक हमारी इक्तसादी और आर्थिक तरक्की करने का ताल्लुक था, किसी भी जालन्धर डिवीजन के आदमी ने हमारी तरफ, चाहे वह हिन्दू हो या सिक्ख हो, कभी देखने की कोशिश नहीं की ।

सभापति महोदय, आपको पता ही है कि यह भाखरा डाम जिसका कि आज दुनिया के अन्दर बडा शोर है मैं पूछना चाहता हूं, कि यह शुरू में जो भाखरा डाम की स्कीम थी यह किन की भलाई के लिए निकाली गई थी और आज उसकी क्या शक्ल है ? क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि यह तमाम का तमाम पानी हरियाना इलाके को देने के लिए इस स्कीम का जन्म हुआ था ? लेकिन आज हम देख रहे हैं कि उसका करीब आधा पानी हरियाना इलाके से बाहर जायेगा । आखिर इसका कारण क्या है ? इसका कारण साफ यह मालूम पड़ता है कि चूंकि हमारे इलाके के लोग सदा से दबे रहे हैं और उनकी कभी कोई आवाज नहीं थी और उनकी बात को कोई सुनने को तैयार नहीं था, इसलिए यह चीज की गई ।

हमारा इलाका पंतजी और कांग्रेस लीडरशिप का हमेशा मशकूर रहेगा जिन्होंने कि हम दबे हुए आदमियों को उनके जायज हक्क (उचित अधिकार) दिलाये हैं । आज हम देखते हैं कि देश के अन्दर जनसंघी और कुछ भाई ऐसे हैं जो हमेशा हिन्दू राष्ट्रवाद और हिन्दुओं के नाम पर अपील करना चाहते हैं और जैसा कि उनका स्वभाव और तरीका है, हिन्दूवाद का नारा लगाते हैं, उनसे मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि हम हरियाने

[चौ० रणवीर सिंह]

के हैं क्या हम लोग हिन्दू नहीं हैं और अगर वे हमें हिन्दू मानते हैं तो फिर क्यों व्यर्थ में हिन्दुओं के नाम की दुहाई दे रहे हैं।

अभी लाला अचित राम ने बतलाया कि हिसार के १ लाख और कुल पंजाब के ५० लाख आदमी ऐसे ह जिनको कि कुछ गिला है और शक है। हमारे अंबाला रीजन (क्षेत्र) के इलाके की आबादी ५१ लाख है, १० लाख की आबादी कांगड़ा जिले की है कि जो कुल मिलाकर ६१ लाख की बनती है और ६० लाख के करीब सिक्ख हैं, तो इन १२० लाख में से कितने आदमी ऐसे हैं जो आज अपने आप को प्रसन्न समझते हैं ? सभापति महोदय, आज हालत बिलकुल साफ है कि सिवाय कम्युनलिस्ट्स (साम्प्रदायियों) के आज कोई आदमी अप्रसन्न नहीं है और अप्रसन्न आखिर क्यों हो क्योंकि जैसा कि मैं कह रहा था ऐसा तो कोई अख्तियार किसी को दिया नहीं गया है कि उसके ऊपर या उसकी ताकत के ऊपर कोई लगाम न हो।

क्या आज यह सत्य नहीं है कि पंजाब के सबसे बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट (उद्योगपति) ने जब रुपया लगाने की बात सोची तो उसने जाकर पेप्सू में अपना रुपया लगाया जहां पर कि ज्यादातर सिखों की आबादी थी ? उसने पंजाब में अपना रुपया लगाने की कोशिश नहीं की। इतिहास इस बात की शहादत है कि पिछले आठ या नौ सालों में जो हिन्दू इंडस्ट्रियालिस्ट्स (उद्योगपति) थे उन्होंने पंजाब के बजाय पेप्सू में ज्यादा रुपया लगाया। आज जो रीजनल कौंसिल (प्रादेशिक परिषद्) बन रही है उसको पेप्सू के बराबर भी अख्तयार नहीं हैं। पेप्सू की सरकार को, बी क्लास स्टेट होने के बावजूद, रीजनल कौंसिल से ज्यादा अख्तियार था। लेकिन अगर कभी वहां पर कोई खराबी आई तो हमारे देश की केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसको बहुत मजबूती से रोका। जब भी कोई खतरा वहां आया, यहां की सरकार को जैसा ऐक्शन (कार्यवाही) लेना चाहिये था वह जायज ऐक्शन उसने लिया। जब यह बात है तो जलन्धर, अमृतसर और लुधियाना के हिन्दू भाई आज क्यों इस बात से घबरायें ? अभी चन्द दिन हुए लाला अचित राम जी भी वहां थे, शायद दो या तीन दिन की बात है, भूमि दान के लिये एक मीटिंग हुई लुधियाने के अन्दर जो किसी पार्टी की मीटिंग नहीं थी, इसी तरह से जलन्धर के अन्दर महाबीर जयन्ती मनाई गई, भगवान महाबीर की जयन्ती किसी पार्टी की जयन्ती नहीं थी। लेकिन इसके बावजूद कुछ आदमियों ने शेवा (धंधा) बना रक्खा हैं कि इस तरह की चीजों में गड़बड़ी पैदा करें। उस भूमिदान की मीटिंग के अन्दर एक आदमी को लाया गया जिसके एक थप्पड़ भी नहीं लगा था, जिसको कोई चोट नहीं लगी थी, जो कि अपने पैर चल कर आया था। अचानक उसको मीटिंग के अन्दर डाल दिया गया और यह नारा लगाया गया कि उसको जान से मार दिया गया। इस तरह का प्रोवोकेशन (उत्तेजन) वहां पर दिया गया। हमारे सोचने की यह बात है कि क्या इस तरह से प्रावोकिशन पैदा करने वाले आदमियों से डर कर हमें राजकाज चलाना है ? अगर दरअस्ल किसी आदमी को कोई चोट लगती या कोई नुकसान होता तो हमारा फर्ज था उसको बचाने का, लेकिन एक आदमी जिसका कोई नुकसान न हुआ हो, उसके लिये कहा जाय कि जान से मार दिया और इस तरह से गड़बड़ी पैदा करने की कोशिश की जाये तो यह हमारे लिये गम्भीरता से सोचने की बात है। इस तरह के कम्युनलिस्टों से डर कर हम आगे नहीं चल सकते।

सभापती महोदय : आप का समय खत्म हो गया।

चौ० रणवीर सिंह : चूंकि मेरा समय खत्म हो रहा है, इसलिये मैं इस विषय को यहीं छोड़ता हूं। दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि दिल्ली-का जो भविष्य बनने जा रहा है उसके अनुसार उसके अन्दर तीन सौ देहात होंगे। जब उनकी कोई ऐसेम्बली (सभा) नहीं होगी और एक कारपोरेशन (निगम) ही यहां बनेगा तो आप जानते ही हैं कि उस कारपोरेशन के अन्दर उन की क्या आवाज होगी ? कारपोरेशन सिस्टम (निगम पद्धति) में उनके आर्थिक हितों का क्या खयाल किया जायेगा यह भी सोचा जा सकता है। कुछ दिन की बात है, बड़े-बड़े साहूकारों ने मकान बनान के लिये जमीनें लीं, बड़े बड़े जमीदारों ने बड़ी बड़ी जमीनों की मिल्कियतें नहीं, बल्कि एक एक एकड़ और दो-दो एकड़ की मिल्कियत के मालिकों की जमीनें लीं। लेकिन वह जमीनें उस भाव पर नहीं ली गइ जो कि बराबर की जमीनों की कीमत थी। आप जानते ही हैं कि सरकारी अफसर जितने हैं उनके अन्दर बहुत बड़ी तादाद ऐसे आदमियों की है जो जमीन से कोई वास्ता नहीं रखते है, जो कि जमीन-पर खेती करने वाले लोगों की मुश्किलात को समझते नहीं है। जमीन कोई मिल्कियत की चीज नहीं है, यह किसान को पेशा देती है।

कारपोरेशन के अन्दर कोई आदमी इस बात को नहीं सोचता है कि अगर वह किसानों की जमीन को लेंगे तो उनका पेशा छीनेंगे । इसलिये मैं यह दरख्वास्त करना चाहता हूं कि अगर इस बिल के मुताबिक दिल्ली की ऐसेम्बली तोड़ी जाये और जो दिल्ली के ढ़ाई, तीन सौ देहात हैं उन में से ज्यादा से ज्यादा देहात यू० पी० या पंजाब को दिये जा सकें तो वे जरूर उन को दे दिये जाये ।

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Mr. Chairman, yesterday, when the hon. Member Shri S. K. Patil spoke, he mentioned the socialist party of passing some contradictory resolutions and as result some members resigning from the party. I do not know if he meant by the socialist party my party, or the party to which I belong. If that is so, such a thing never happened and I will just say that he has exhibited his own ignorance about the position of my party. I want to say that Government is guilty of bringing this Bill before the House after it was soaked in the blood of our nationals who were killed in the streets of Bombay for the simple crime that they wanted to exercise the right of self-expression.

The white paper issued by the Government of Bombay stands witness to the fact that 500 times firing was resorted to, 2700 bullets were shot, 278 people were wounded of whom 17 were women, three babies of about three months old, over 100 were crippled, 72 killed and 69 were shot above the waist, signifying that the police shot to kill.

There are charges and counter-charges between the Government of Bombay and the Maharashtrian people. I think a judicial enquiry is necessary because the wound has to be healed. Often our Ministers request the people to heal the wound. How can the wound be healed unless a judicial enquiry is held to sort out the faults and put responsibility on those concerned. In this way only the wound can be healed.

To my mind, as an outsider, I feel that Bombay city belongs to Maharashtra geographically, culturally and linguistically. If the Government have recommended that it should remain as a Centrally administered territory, they are playing into the hands of the capitalists; and nothing more than that. If the Government speaks of democracy and socialism in the true sense of the term, then I request them to listen to the voice of the people. What are the voice of the people? The Bombay Corporation recommended the integration of the proposed Bombay territory with Maharashtra. Several members of Bombay Legislative Assembly resigned and were re-elected on this issue uncontested. Several representatives of municipalities and village panchayats resigned. Several lakhs of Maharashtrian labourers in Bombay city went on strike and 4,000 satyagrahis have already courted imprisonment and are in jail. The whole of Maharashtrian community is prepared to go to jail on this issue. I want to sound a note of warning to the Government that if any leader of Maharashtra is trying to bargain on this popular issue, I say the Maharashtrians simply will not tolerate it and those leaders will be considered as brokers not as leaders, and not as true representatives of the people. The Government of India should take note of this fact seriously. Due to time limitation I shall leave the question of Maharashtra here. I would like to mention something about the proposed union territories. The word territory smacks of imperialism. Why should the Government of India take away or withdraw the democratic right which the people of Delhi and Himachal Pradesh are at present enjoying? I say that this is a retrograde step. Is it not so? Why should the Government of India deny the democratic right to the people of Manipur and Tripura, who have been fighting since the integration of their States for democratic rights? In free India, in Republican India, there should be no State where there is no Legislative Assembly. If Government are prepared to extend democratic rights even to the extent of villages, why Manipur, Tripura, Delhi and Himachal Pradesh cannot have a democratic set-up in their own respective States. I do not understand the logic of the Government. Often it is stated that all these States are politically backward. I wish to remind the House, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister may not like it—the fact that Manipur was the first State to have he democratic set-up in the whole of India. Manipur has a unique culture. Is it proper to call Manipur a politically backward State? It is not for me to answer but I would like the House to answer it; I also would like the Joint Committee to take note of it and give a proper reply.

There is another point. It is also said that these States are deficit States. May I remind the House of this fact that when Government is taking foreign aid,

[Shri Rishang Keishing]

don't it say that there should be no political strings attached. The Government has rightly done it and I endorse this view. But, when Govt. are extending some financial help to its own poor countrymen, it want to attach all sorts of political strings. Government say: "You are being given some financial aid and so you cannot therefore, have a democratic set-up. We must control you. We shall send a Chief Commissioner and some other officers from here and they must rule over you as our agent. You must listen to and tolerate them because you are getting financial help from us." This is a great injustice. Cannot Government consider us as its own countrymen? When the Government ask the foreigners not to attach any political strings, is it proper for her to attach all sorts of strings on us? I think it as a matter of shame. How can we show our face to the foreigners when we are ourselves doing like this? Our Home Minister is a great democrat and he believes in socialism in the true sense of the word. I am sure he would consider our case and allow us to enjoy the democratic set-up which the whole of India has got since 15th August, 1947.

5 P.M.

I would say something about merger of States. The talk of merger of Bengal and Bihar should be dropped here and now. Formerly, the two Chief Ministers talked of complete merger of the two States. Now, there is the talk of loose merger or some sort of a loose union. This will mean creating a Sub-zonal Council within the proposed Zonal Council. I think this is only a face-saving tactic. I would request the Chief Ministers of Bengal and Bihar to come out openly before the public and say: "We have committed a mistake." This is a democratic country and as democrats they should come out boldly before the people and say that they have committed this mistake in proposing the merger of the two States, forgive us.

The last point is regarding the border disputes. I want that the border disputes should be settled through plebiscite. We must take the village as a unit. It does not mean, as the Prime Minister says, that we are going to extend civil war to the villages. I want to reduce the area of disagreement and dispute to the minimum *i.e.* to the village. There, a plebiscite can be taken. Border disputes should thus be settled through a plebiscite.

श्री बन्सीलाल : सभापति महोदय, अभी कुछ देर पहले मेरे मित्र ज्वालाप्रसाद जी ने अजमेर के बारे में कुछ कहा और उसका इतिहास बताया कि किस प्रकार अजमेर जब राजस्थान बना तो उसमें सम्मिलित नहीं हुआ और अब जबकि अजमेर राजस्थान में मिल रहा है तो अजमेर को ही राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाया जाना चाहिए। जिस समय राज्य पुनर्गठन के मसले पर वाद विवाद समाप्त हुआ था उस समय आदरणीय गृह मंत्री जी ने अजमेर के सम्बन्ध में यह विचार प्रकट किया था कि अजमेर राजस्थान में मिल रहा है और जो कुछ उसके लिए हो सकेगा, किया जायेगा और उनकी इस बात से एक ऐसा वातावरण राजस्थान में और अजमेर में बना कि दोनों को ही संतोष हुआ। अब जब कि अजमेर को राजस्थान में मिलाने की बात लगभग तय हो गई है उस समय कोई भी इस प्रकार की मांगका पेश किया जाना जिससे मिलने से पहले जो वातावरण पैदा होना चाहिए उसमें कुछ बिगाड़ पैदा हो, किसी प्रकार से भी उचित नहीं कहा जा सकता। मेरे मित्र अजमेर के प्रतिनिधि ने अजमेर को राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाने के बारे में जो दलीलें पेश की और इस सदन का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित किया, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अजमेर को राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है। इसका कारण यह है कि जयपुर में काफी बड़ी तादाद में बिल्डिंग्स (भवन) बन चुकी हैं और करोड़ों रुपया वहां पर खर्चा किया जा चुका है। इसके मुकाबले में न तो अजमेर में कोई मकान ही हैं और न ही वहां पर पीने के लिए पानी की कोई व्यवस्था है। मगर इसका यह अर्थ नहीं कि राजस्थान के लोग अजमेर की उन्नति नहीं चाहते। मेरा कहना तो केवल इतना है कि क्योंकि अजमेर का राजस्थान में मिलना निश्चित है, इस वास्ते इस प्रकार की मांग करके वातावरण को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश नहीं की जानी चाहिए।

मैं सखेद यह बात देखता हूं कि राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में हमारे नेताओं ने एक योजना देश के सामने रखी है और हमारे देश का नक्शा बदलने की कोशिश की है और ऐसी सूरत में हम कांग्रेसजनों का यह कर्तव्य था कि हम जनता को उसके लिए तैयार करते, जो कि हमने नहीं किया। हमारे देश की अधिकतर जनता जहां इस राज्य पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में जो सरकारी योजना है उसका साथ देने के लिए तैयार थी। वहां हम कांग्रेसजनों ने उस फिजा को बिगाड़ने

में काफी योग दिया है और उसको भड़काने का प्रयत्न किया है । जो हमारी जिम्मेदारी थी उसे हमें स्वीकार करना चाहिए था ।

मैं यह भी देखता हूं कि इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में जो कि सिलैक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) के सुपुर्द किया जा रहा है काफी उत्तेजनापूर्ण वातावरण यहां पर भी पाया जाता है । मैं समझता हूं कि जिस प्रकार से उत्तेजनापूर्ण भाषण यहां किए जाते हैं, उनका काफी असर बाहर देश के लोगों के ऊपर पड़ता है । यह चीज उस पार्टी के लिए जिसके कंधों पर शासन चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है, शोभा नहीं देती है । बम्बई के मामले को लेकर तथा दूसरी समस्याओं को लेकर जिस प्रकार के उत्तेजनात्मक भाषण होते हैं उससे दूसरी जगहों पर जहां पर कि अच्छा काम हो रहा है, जो लोग लालायित हैं तमाम रियासतों को दूसरा चित्र देने के लिए, उनके दिल में भी फर्क आ जाता है । मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो भी समस्यायें हमारे सामने हैं और जो बीमारी हमारे समक्ष उपस्थित है, उसका एक मात्र हल यह है कि देश में एकतंत्र, एक इकाई शासन की स्थापना करना । आगे या पीछे एक न एक दिन आपको एक इकाई शासन लागू करना ही होगा । मैं समझता हूं कि आज देश का वातावरण इसके अनुकूल है और लोग इसके लिये तैयार हैं । मेरा यह पक्का विश्वास है कि आज अगर देश के लोगों का इसके बारे में मत लिया जाये तो अधिकांश लोग, कम से कम ६० से लेकर ७० प्रतिशत लोग, या इससे भी अधिक इसके पक्ष में अपना मत देंगे और कहेंगे कि इस देश में एक इकाई शासन कायम होना चाहिए । अगर आज हमारे देश की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में जिस प्रकार की स्थिति है, जिस प्रकार से हमारे नेताओं का जनता के ऊपर प्रभाव है, और जिस तरह का सारे देश में वातावरण है उसका उपयोग करके देश के अन्दर एक इकाई शासन की स्थापना के लिए कदम उठाये जाते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं हमारी तमाम की तमाम समस्यायें हल हो जायेंगी । ऐसा करने से बम्बई की, दिल्ली की तथा और जो भी दूसरी समस्यायें हैं, वे सब हल हो जायेंगी । बाकी जिस तरह से बम्बई के प्रश्न को लेकर तथा दूसरे प्रान्तों के प्रश्नों को लेकर के हमारे देश के अन्दर वातावरण बना है वह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है ।

जहां तक अजमेर का प्रश्न है मैं पुनः यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इसको राजधानी बनाने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता और राजस्थान के लोग अजमेर की जनता का स्वागत करने के लिये तैयार हैं । वे चाहते हैं कि अजमेर राजस्थान में मिले और जो पुराना इतिहास अजमेर का रहा है उससे राजस्थान की जो आज हालत है उसमें सुधार हो ।

मगर इस प्रकार की मांग करने से कि अजमेर को राजस्थान की राजधानी बनाया जाये, न जयपुर का भला होने वाला है और न ही अजमेर का भला होने वाला है ।

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh (Inner Manipur): Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my thanks to you for having given me an opportunity to participate in this debate at this fag end of the day.

At the outset I should like to say, with all due respect to the hon. Home Minister, that the present Bill is the blackest Bill ever introduced in this House since independence so far as it relates to the so-called centrally administered territories. Hitherto, these areas are known as Part C States. Under the Government ot Part C States Act, the substance of democracy was extended to some of these States. There are also certain other Part C States where not a single substance of democracy was known or was functioning. This condition will remain the same before the new Act comes in to operation. In Part C States, such as Delhi and Himachal Pradesh, where democracy was functioning, that democracy has been robbed away by this new Bill. They have been reduced to the status of a territory. That is because of contempt and hatred and unsympathetic attitude towards these States from a certain section of the people who were determined to abolish these States gradually. Why, under the great leadership of Pandit G. B. Pant, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and under the inspiration of Gandhiji, should these Part C States be treated with so much contempt and hatred, I do not know. Take Delhi. It has been reduced to the status of the Andamans.

There is another point. Here we have the Part VIII, the States in Part C of the First Schedule of the Constitution. Now, in article 240 of the Constitution under this Part VIII, it is said:

> "Parliament may by law create or continue for any State specified in Part C of the First Schedule and

[Shri L. Jogeswar Singh]

administered through a Chief Commissioner or Lieutenant-Governor—

(a) a body, whether nominated, elected or partly nominated and partly elected, to function as a Legislature for the State; or

(b) a Council of Advisers or Ministers, or both with such constitution, powers and functions, in each case, as may be specified in the law".

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

This is the status provided for the Part C States in the Constitution, which gives democracy however limited it may be in its form and context. Now, according to the present Bill and according to the amendment proposed to the Constitution, these States namely Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura, have been reduced to the status of Part D territories. In that case, our position will be as mentioned in article 243 of the Constitution. In the present Bill, the same article—article 243—has been copied word for word, sentence for sentence, without a single omission of any comma. In article 243, it has been mentioned that these areas known as Part D territories shall be administered by the President through a Chief Commissioner or other authority to be appointed by him. Similarly the present amendment to the Constitution says that the existing Part C States such as Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Delhi and Tripura should be administered through a Chief Commissioner or other authority to be appointed by the President. That is to say, in the future set-up, there will be no democracy in these States. There will be no democratic set-up in these States—Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura because any authority that is going to be appointed for the administration of these States is to be appointed by the President himself. In this aspect, there is no sense of proportion. I think this is against the spirit and letter of the Home Minister's reply to the debate on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission last time. During the last debate, in reply to the debate on the S.R.C. report, the hon. Home Minister said :

"There has been a demand on behalf of Manipur and also of Tripura that they should be given some voice in the management of their affairs. I fully appreciate their wishes in that regard. I hope something will be done towards that end". (pp. 1415-1416, Lok Sabha debates on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission—14th December to 23rd December 1955, Volume II.)

This is from the speech of the Home Minister, in the course of his reply to the debate on the S.R.C. report last time. The Home Minister wants to appreciate the wishes of the people. But what are the wishes of the people of Manipur and Tripura? They have been demanding a rightful share in the administration of their States in a democratic set-up for several years now. In 1947, there was general election in Manipur before integration. Manipur had got elected legislature there before many other Princely States ushered in elected Government in their States. That elected legislature in Manipur was abolished at the time of integration for the restoration of democratic set-up the people have been fighting for many years now. The hon. Home Minister wants to fulfil the wishes of the people of Manipur and Tripura, but the proposed amendment of the Constitution is quite contrary to the spirit and letter of the Home Minister's reply.

I would like to submit to the Home Minister that we are entirely against the term "Centrally-administered territories". I would request the Home Minister to change the word "territories" into "States" and call them "centrally-administered States". We consider "territories" as something contemptuous. Our States have been reduced to the status of "territories" which sounds something like "colonies" and we are treated like depressed classes. If there is no difficulty in changing the terminology, I would request the Home Minister to change the name into "Centrally-administered States". I know that it is not the mistake of the Home Minister; it is the mistake of the draftsmen who drafted the Bill. They did not follow the train of thought of the Home Minister. They have got some bias or prejudice against this small territory. Therefore, when they drafted this Bill, they did not apply their minds carefully; they actually copied the provisions of article 243 of Part IX of the Constitution word for word, sentence for sentence, relating to the administration of Andaman or other penal islands.

In deciding the form of Government for Manipur and Tripura, why are you confining yourself to the four walls of the Indian Constitution alone? You have to go to other democracies functioning in the world. Take the democratic set-up in Switzerland, U.S.A. or Russia. In Switzerland there is the Canton scheme of Government, which is the most democratic form of Government elected by the people. This gives maximum democracy to the minimum population. The Canton is a federal unit of a federal Government. Why do you confine yourself to a formula which fixes a minimum population for a State? That is against the concept of democracy. In Russia, for instance out of 16 republics there is a republican unit called Karele. It has a population which is less than that of Tripura or Manipur, but still it is a separate republican unit. Even in the United States of America, there are more than half a dozen small States, having a population less than that of Manipur or Tripura, but enjoying the status of being separate States on account of traditions, language, culture and history. Why do you forget these things when you make provision for the Hill States? If you apply your mind seriously, I think this problem can easily be solved. I do believe that the hon. Home Minister can evolve a formula whereby the substance of democracy may be extended to these ancient States. The formula for a democratic set-up can be evolved only when sections 239 and 240 of the Constitution are retained as they are now, and the proposed amendment in Part VIII of the Constitution is dropped. I should like to request the hon. Home Minister to see that the above sections are retained and the new amendment is dropped.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: I am finishing. I shall tell you about the feelings of my people. I shall read out a resolution passed by the Manipur State Congress Committee in a meeting jointly held with the members of the electoral college. This resolution represents the feelings of the Manipuris on this Bill :—

> "Extracts from the proceedings of the joint sitting of the Executive Committee, Manipur State Congress Committee and the Congress members of the Electoral College held on 8-4-56 with Shri M. Koireng Singh in the Chair.
>
> Resolution No. 2.
>
> The Executive Committee in a joint meeting with the Congress members of the Electoral College, have considered the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956 in some details. The Committee regrets to note that the Bill makes no provisions for introduction of democratic set up of administration in Manipur. The people of Manipur take it as adding fuel to burning fire because they have been long demanding responsible government and they have strongly resented the delay as well as the present degradation of the status of their State to that of a Territory.
>
> The Committee therefore resolve that the Government of India be requested to incorporate in the present Bill provisions for introduction of responsible government in Manipur consisting of a legislature and a Council of Ministers responsible to it."

We are not demanding a full-fledged responsible form of Government. We want an elected legislature and elected Ministers. That is all. We do not like all the costly paraphernalia of a modern democratic set-up. We require the substance of democracy to be given to this so-called Centrally administered territory. We do not like the word 'territory'. Please drop the word 'territory' and call it a 'Centrally administered State'.

Shri Bimalaprosad Chaliha: (Sibsagar-North Lakhimpur): Mr. Speaker, it is only on one subject that I thought of speaking on this Bill. If I have liked anything in this Bill, it is the proposal for the establishment of zonal councils. It is good that we have become wise from our experience and we have seen the reality of the situation.

One thing is clear that India with its people possessing what may be called intolerance for language cannot exist. It is bound to explode one day and bring a catastrophe. I want to be more clear. I say that the spirit of linguistic States is not conducive for the unity of India. In a sense it is good that the most dangerous symptoms of this great disease have manifested timely enough, for us to take proper steps. What are we to do? The feelings of the people cannot be changed simply by a legislative measure. This is a matter which

[Shri Bimalaprosad Chaliha]

requires a change of outlook and understanding and foresight. I am sure that when our future generations one day will read the history of the fights we have entered into they will simply take us to be fools. Therefore, it is desirable that we think of suitable measures to integrate India in the real sense of the term. The provision for zonal councils, I feel, is a right step because these will bring about better understanding between the people and the States and also a better appreciation of the problems. I am sure that this is not the only measure by which we could achieve that. But I have no doubt that this is a happy beginning. We attach great hope to the scheme of zonal councils, and we want that it is followed and implemented not only in letter but also in spirit. We have also to see that the zonal councils achieve its objects satisfactorily.

Let us now examine the functions of the zonal councils. These are laid down in clause 21 of the Bill. While there is enough scope for zonal councils, in many respects there are certain specific provisions which have been made in this Bill with regard to the particular subjects which they will deal with. It is laid down in clause 21(2) and I would read out.

> "....a Zonal Council may discuss, and make recommendations with regard to,—
>
> (a) any matter connected with, or arising out of, the reorganisation of the States under this Act, such as border disputes, linguistic minorities, and inter-State transport;
>
> (b) any matter concerning economic planning; and
>
> (c) all matters of common interest and benefit to the people in the field of social planning."

All this seem to be wise and good. The deliberations in these councils will bring about a better understanding, a better appreciation of problems, and above all, a spirit of unity. But I have doubts whether the spirit that is proposed to be created through these zonal councils will not be polluted by the provision laid down in clause 17(4) for voting. I have apprehensions that this provision for voting may ultimately spoil the very spirit to create which we are proposing the formation of these zonal councils.

This provision, instead of bringing about unity, may lead to alignments which may ultimately bring about disunity, misunderstanding. If as a result of such alignment, some States fall out, then all the hopes that we have fixed on these institutions will be lost.

I would therefore suggest that this provision for voting should go. After all, it is not our intention to impose anything on any State without its consent. It is only in order to maintain the spirit of unity, that we are proposing these councils. For the present these zonal councils will function only in an advisory capacity. The deliberations will bring about a better understanding and that much-wanted spirit of unity.

I therefore plead that only unanimous decisions in these zonal council should have the force of an advice either to the Central Government or to the State Government. If such unanimity be not there on any occasion the matter could be raised again and again. If there be truth and logic in what they proposed then it is quite certain that the responsible people with whom we want to form these zonal councils will agree to the proposal. I personally attached great importance to the deletion of the provision in regard to voting in the zonal councils. I would earnestly appeal to Government and to the Joint Committee to do away with this provision for voting.

Mr. Speaker : The Home Minister will reply tomorrow.

5-29 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Thursday the 26th April, 1956.

DAILY DIGEST

[*Wednesday, 25th April, 1956*]

COLUMNS

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT . . . 6293–96

The Speaker withheld his consent to the moving of an adjournment motion given notice of by Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta and Shri K. Ananda Nambiar regarding alleged arrest of certain Pro-Samuykta Maharashtra demonstrators in New Delhi on the 24th April, 1956.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED 6298

Fifty first Report was presented.

REPORT OF RULES COMMITTEE PRESENTED . . . 6322

Third Report was presented.

COLUMNS

MOTION TO REFER BILL TO JOINT COMMITTEE . . 6299–6322, 6323–6420

Further discussion on the motion to refer the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee was continued. The discussion was not concluded.

AGENDA FOR THURSDAY, 26TH APRIL 1956.—

Consideration of Third Report of Rules Committee. Further discussion on the motion to refer the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee and discussion on motion to refer the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill to a Joint Committee.

GIPN—Night—97 Lok Sabha—15-2-57